

A
R E V I E W
O F
Mr. M. H. NEW NOTION
O F
S C H I S M,
A N D T H E
Vindication
O F I T.
By M^r Murrey.

IMPRIMATUR,

March 10.
1692.

*Guil. Lancaster R. P. D. Henrico
Ep^o. Londin. & Sacris Domest.*

L O N D O N,
Printed for E. Mory at the Bible in St. Paul's Church yard. 1692.

REVIEWS

OF MR. MATHIAS NOTION

SCHEISM

AND THE

Vindication

OF IT.

By M. MATHIAS.

IMPRIMATUR

Given under the Great Seal of Great Britain
His Majesty's Secretary of State

March 10
1792

LONDON

Printed for A. Mays at the Sign of the Crown in St. Pauls Church-yard 1792

A Review of Mr. M. H.'s New Notion of Schism, and the Vindication of it.

THE Vindicator begins with a Complaint of the unhappy *Vindic. p. 1.* Flames which have been kindled amongst us about matters of Church Government, and Worship. And tells us further, That he must be as great an Enemy, that would not contribute his utmost to the extinguishing of them. And so far I confess we agree with him; but whether Mr. H. and his Vindicator be the sole Extinguisher, is a Question that may deserve some further debate. More has been said to the former already, than he is at leisure to answer; and therefore I shall only add one thing at present, viz. That those who have learnt out the first occasion of Mr. H.'s Book, tell me, That it was to satisfy the Scruples of some particular persons, whom his Followers would have allured and drawn into his Conventicle. It was not to reconcile the Differences amongst so many learned Men as are engaged in this Controversie. Neither was it to inform the world concerning that mighty Secret, the true Cause of our Animosities, viz. That all other wars and fightings proceed from our lusts, that war in our minds. *St. James Ib. p. 3.* was aware of that, long before Mr. H. And as for his New Notion of Schism, [the breach of Love] it was calculated for the Ladies, and the great design of his Book was to make two Female Protestants. Mr. H.'s Attempt was indeed modest, because this was all he aimed at, but this Vindicator abuses him, by ascribing too much to him. To place him in the Chair of Controversy, and make him the determining Oracle over those two learned Parties, the Churchmen and Dissenters, is enough to make any Man's head giddy, if he be not extremely confident; and is so plain an Abuse upon Mr. H. as must needs put him (if he be not very stupid) quite out of countenance. Especially if he does but remember what little success his Book had with those for whose sake it was written. For if it were not able to unsettle the minds of one or two of the weaker Sex, surely he cannot expect it to controul the sentiments of wise and learned Men. And therefore it was an Abuse upon Mr. H. and an high piece of Arrogance in the Vindicator, to make so many his Pupils: as if all the Conformists and Nonconformists understood nothing at all either of the Duty of Charity, or the Cause of Animosities, or the Nature of Schism, till Mr. H. first informed them, and shewed em their mistake.

The Churchmen are absolutely condemned (if this Gentleman be *Vindic. p. 1. & 2.* Judge) for imposing unnecessary suspected terms of Communion, meer Trifles, under severe Penalties, Fines, Imprisonments, Exile, &c. And certainly they were extremely to blame, if all this were done, and no body reclaimed; as it seems his experience had sufficiently convinced him: But *P. 2.*

other Mens experience makes 'em of a contrary Opinion, who, notwithstanding all the constancy which this Man boasts of, found the Dissenters generally to good natur'd and flexible, that during the little time the Laws were executed, a dangerous Faction was broken, and more done towards bringing English Protestants to Uniformity, than ten thousand such little blue Books as these of Mr. H. and his *Vindicator* will be able to effect. The good English Protestants, tho' a little fond of Novelty, yet when once the Teachers were suppress'd, whose interest it was to bellow against all Establishments, soon came into the Church: and without any fear of those *Mormos* wherewith they had been formerly terrified, did readily and chearfully join with us, in full communion. And perhaps the Teachers themselves might have learnt *Uniformity* by this time, through the execution of those penal Acts, as well as their Predecessors and Brethren, did before 'em. For the *Nonconformists* are not such absolute despisers of the things of this world, as never to look about 'em for secular advantage, tho' not so much I hope as to debauch their Consciences, yet enough to open their Eyes. And therefore when they saw themselves deprived of those goodly *Tythe-Barns* which had so plentifully fed them, and that the Government was firmly settled which turned them out, and whichal knew they should have spoiled one another, if they had all *Conventicled*: they thought it high time to make further Inquiry into the terms of our Communion; and finding them at last to be much better than they imagined, many of the ablest and best thought fit to comply. More I am sure they were than either five or six; and therefore he needs not upbraid us with that number being departed from us: it being no wonder if five or six Clergymen in all England should be so ill preferred, and so little deserving; as to find at their interest to go over to the *Conventicles*, upon the opening of a *Toleration*, where less Learning will serve; and they will be much better paid, and thought of, than we could find them worthy.

Nor are the Penal Laws any more the Support of our Trifles, than the Penal Ordinances formerly were of theirs, (I mean, the *Directory*;) witness that 23^d of August, 1645. That if any Person or Persons whatsoever, shall at any time, or times hereafter, use, or cause the aforesaid Book of Common-Prayer to be used in any Church, or Chappel, or publick Place of Worship; or in any private Place, or Family, within the Kingdom of England, or Dominion of Wales, or Port and Town of Berwick, every such Person so offending therein, shall for the first Offence, pay the Sum of Five Pounds of lawfull English Money; for the second Offence, Ten Pounds; and for the third, shall suffer One whole Year: Imprisonment, without Bail or Mainprife. More of this kind may be seen in that Ordinance, but from this it is evident, 1. That our Ceremonies did not fall into such Contempt, as the *Vindicator* supposes, 2. when the Enforcements were taken away, that being done by a former Ordinance, Jan. 23. 1644. for if they

they had, there had been no occasion for these severe *Penalties*. 2. That *Enforcements* were necessary to support the *Directory*. And lastly, That they were necessary to preserve it from Contempt, for thus it was ordained, *Aug. 23^d 1645. That what Person soever shall with intent to bring the said Directory into contempt or neglect, or to raise opposition against it, preach, write, print, or cause to be written, or printed, any thing in the derogation, or depraving of the said Book, or any thing therein contained, or any part thereof, shall lose and forfeit for every such Offence, such a Sum of Money, as shall, at the time of his Conviction, be thought fit to be imposed upon him; by those before whom he shall have his Trial: provided it be not less than Five Pounds, nor exceeding the Sum of Fifty Pounds.* In this Act they have an Eye to those that might preach it into Contempt. So that it was not of such value in the Eyes of their own Ministers, but several of those who were at that time in possession of the Pulpits might possibly fall away, and preach against it. And as for the Service of the Church, Men were so far from totally neglecting it, that after Ten Years suspension of the Penal Laws, they found it necessary to discourage it. He that used the Book of Common-Prayer was so be adjudged scandalous, ejected out of his Living, and expelled the whole Parish, for fear lest he should make an Interest against the new *Modes*. So that here it seems Fines, Imprisonments, and Exile, were found as necessary to support the Presbyterian and Independant Worship, as the Church-Liturgie, and People were then as true to the latter as either Mr. H. or his *Vindicator* can be to the former.

But why are Penal Laws only the Props of controverted Ceremonies? The Papists, as well as other Dissenters, were obnoxious to the same Laws, as this Gentleman may well remember, since they joined their Interest and Malice to have them repeal'd; and yet, I hope, he will not say that the Papists were ever punish'd for not complying with Ceremonies: nor can it be reasonably affirm'd concerning their Fellow-Sufferers, unless frequenting the Church, and receiving the Sacraments, disturbing Ministers, and holding Conventicles, Things which the Penal Laws do principally regard, are no more but Ceremonies: i. e. in the language of this modest Gentleman, *all Trifles*, pag. 2. and *Religious Impertinancies*, pag. 13. (M. 15)

I shall not trouble my self with giving further Reasons for the execution of those Laws, nor to shew him that Religion has been preserved by such under most Christian Emperors; for having shewn it to be the practice of their own R. Parliament, and *Oliver*, I suppose it is *inftar omnium*; and will go farther with this *Vindicator* to make it authentick, than all the examples from *Confession* to our own Age.

It will be more proper for us to enquire into Mr. H's peaceable design, and how he has managed the *Weapon* (viz. the Notion of Schism) which he lately wrested out of the *Gladiator's* hand. Vind. p. 4. it being certainly a matter of no small importance; for if his account be so clear as this Gent. makes it, all Church Discipline is out of doors; their

OWN

own as well as ours : and a Man may appeal from the School of Repentance, to the Quakers Meeting-house, without any guilt, if breach of Communion be no Schism, as these Gent. alledge : But if his account be not clear, or his Notion defective, or a false signification imposed upon the word Schism, then he has acquired no body : the sober, moderate, and peaceable, must come to Church still ; and only the worst sort of Bigots remain in the Conventicle. The management of this business being therefore of such grand importance, upon both accounts, let us see how the little Champion has wielded his weapon.

We have some reason in the first place to question the peaceableness of his design : for the Notion it self being contrived to encourage, and justify Separation ; I am afraid the last result, and consequence of it, will not be Peace. Suppose a Man should introduce the same Doctrine into the State, and tell People that it is lawful to act in separate Bodies ; That they need not own the present Government, nor submit to King William's Laws ; they may govern themselves by a distinct Politie of their own ; they may be for King James, or a Commonwealth, according to their several apprehensions : The Nature and Rights of Government are things dark, and obscure, and wickal so trivial, and light, that it is not material what Form of Government, or Person prevails : so that *diversity of Opinion, Judgement, or Apprehension, cannot be call'd, or lookt upon, in it self, a thing criminal*, Mr. H's Enq. p. 7. provided they still preserve Charity. King William will never be so cruel as to hang 'em, only because their heads are not exactly of his size, ib. p. 19. I fancy those who are at the helm would scarce be persuaded that his designs were peaceable, tho' he should second this Discourse with the most earnest persuasions to Charity. And if Mr. H. or any body else, should attempt to debauch 'em with such anarchical Principles, he would be reckoned a mover of Sedition, rather than a healer of Breaches ; and perhaps meet with such a Confutation, as the best Vindicator he has would not know what to say to. And his attempt is not much better with relation to the Church ; it being not easy to conceive, how he that sets People at liberty to divide and break into Parties, (as Mr. H. does,) can be a promoter of Peace : for if it be lawful for People to separate, and break into Parties, there will be no longer any Union, than while their Interests, and perhaps their Humors, as well as their Principles, oblige them to it. When the several Religious Interests once come to interfere, the Parties themselves will fall out ; and while they are striving for the mastery, not only ruin the Ecclesiastical, but likewise endanger the Civil Peace.

Of this we had sufficient experience in the former Confusions, when the moderate, as well as the fierce, were engaged in the Cause, and every Man lent a Coal to enflame the Controversy. The moderate and peaceable Presbyterians, one that had obtained that character

racter among all that knew him; could nevertheless tell the world in his Epistle, *That Churches were not to be own'd, after the independent mode: for it would lay the foundation of strife and division in the Kingdom, to have two ways of Church-Government, which may agree with some Machiavilian, but no Christian Policy, &c.* And the Parliament was applauded by another moderate Gent. *Because they endeavour'd to fence the Vineyard with a sated Militia, and then to gather out the Malignants as Stones, and to make a Winepress therein for the squeezing of Delinquents.* And the mild Independent is the very same, when he comes to be uppermost. Good Kings ought to put upon their People Laws, and strait binding to the Purity of Religion, and the Worship of God. It is not an Impeachment to their Christian Liberty, (as the Anabaptists do vainly talk) but an Ornament to their Beauty, making their Necks comely, as with a Chain of Gold. They were not only to chide the Money-changers, but to whip them away, and overturn the very Tables, lest they should recover their Trade again. *Dagon is begun to fall before the Ark, his Head is off, but let not so much as the stump remain.* And if the like disorders should happen again, I am very much afraid lest these two charitable Gentlemen, Mr. H. and his Vindicator, would become as great Incendiaries, as any of the former. (Mr. H. already is not without grains of malice, too often sprinkled among his Charity.) And as for the Vindicator he is all o're spite, and from the beginning of his Book throughout, by his false and malicious Suggestions, he breaks the Laws of Charity, and shews himself a *Schismatick*, according to his own Notion. Nay, at last, when he draws towards a Conclusion, lest his Readers should not have noted his many *spiteful Reflections*, he takes care to put them in mind, with a great deal of boasting Insolence, *how roughly, i. e. how maliciously* he has treated T. W. p. 90. From such Men who are so uncharitable, even while they pretend the contrary, and such Nations which introduce *Anarchy, Confusion, and Licentiousness*, little Peace is to be expected, whatever is design'd. We know it is too much the custom of Politicians, to cry *Peace, Peace*, even when they mean nothing less: and every Man that has but the sense of the Kid in the Fable, will easily perceive in the present Case, that altho' it may be the voice of the Goat which we hear, yet it is really the Wolf that stands at the door.

Nor is Mr. H. more unfortunate in his Methods of peace, than he is in the description of Schism. It is certainly the latest that has been coined, and perhaps the wildest that ever any man father'd upon the Scriptures, or offer'd to set up in contradiction to the received opinion of Sixteen hundred years.

He tells us p. 15. that *Schism is an uncharitable distance, division, or alienation of affections, among those who are called Christians; and agree in the fundamentals of Religion, occasioned by their different apprehensions about little things.* From which description of Schism, (if I understand it right) these following particulars may be regularly drawn. First of

Colton upon
the first of the
Canonicles.

Mr. Bridge.

of all, That he that was never truly admitted into the Christian Church, may be guilty of Schism if he be called a Christian. For Mr. H. tells us that Schism is among those who are called Christians. Secondly, That Hereticks in fundamentals are no Schismatics; for Mr. H. supposes that where there is a Schism both parties must agree in the fundamentals of Religion. So that the grossest Hereticks are excus'd from Schism, which falls heaviest upon those who differ about the smallest things, which is all one as if he should have said, the less the fault, is the greater the crime. For instance, If people divide from the Church because they will not own the divinity of our Saviour, or the doctrine of the Trinity; these people are no Schismatics, because they differ in fundamentals: but if two Gentlemen of his own Congregation should happen to fall out, and carry at a distance because they could not agree about the upper end of a Seat in Mr. H's Meeting-house, this would be the horrid crime of Schism, the *Arch rebel against God*, according to every branch of the aforesaid description. Thirdly, Another inference to be made from it is, that alienation of affections is Schism, but a division, and alienation of Communion, is not. And consequently no one can charge another with Schism, except he be able to look into his heart; It being impossible to know according to this description, that people are really Schismatics, if they profess themselves to be in charity, except we could make enquiry into the secrets of their hearts, and discover every thing transacted there. And on the contrary, people may be the greatest Schismatics under the outward professions of Charity, and yet no body can accuse them with that fault. If these propositions be duly inferr'd from Mr. H's description, I believe he will not find many that will join with the Vindicator in his commendation of it.

And as for the clearness he talks of, there are so many ambiguities still remaining, as perhaps may trouble another inquirer to explain to us. As 1st, Whether the uncharitable distance must really be among those who are Christians, or them that are none? for people many times call things by wrong names. Secondly, What he means by fundamentals of Religion? Whether *salutis*, or *theologica veritatis*? Whether those that are so to every man in his private capacity? Or those which are the fundamentals of Church Communion? Thirdly, What he means by little things? Whether division of affection about all manner of little things be Schism? Or only about Ecclesiastical little things, the *wisps and Religious imperinencies* which the Vindicator so frequently despises? The clearing of these particulars had been of no small importance in this controversy, and therefore if the describer had been pleas'd to have explained them to us, his notion might have been abundantly clearer than it is.

But

† Duo remanent
Eld. & Medad
non imperii neg-
ligentes sed bu-
militer submissi
dum se honore
arbitrantur in-
dignos Hieron.
Ep. ad Fabiol.
* Theod. que-
rit. Eldad. &
Medad. η δὲ
πρεσβυτεροι
ταυτων μὴ συ-
ναγισθῃσαντες
τοις ἑβδου-
κωντα; ipseque
respondet eos
fuisse ius αἵ-
αν τοις ἑβδου-
κωντα.

They were left behind in the [†] Camp, and there the Spirit rested upon them; which was a sufficient proof to *Moses*, that God had admitted them to the government, altho absent from the Tabernacle: Especially considering that they were of them that were written, so that he might not exclude them. And therefore Mr. H. does impertinently alledge in this case, 1 Cor. 14. 32. *That the Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the * Prophets.* Neither can he find that any of them scrupled, or refused, that Religious impertinence of coming to the Tabernacle; or to join with the rest in full communion: which had been the most eminent circumstance in the whole affair to his purpose. Nay lastly, the business was chiefly secular, and distant from that which did more peculiarly belong to the Ecclesiastical body: and therefore there could be nothing in this case to illustrate the business of Schism.

But why is this the only Text that occurs in the old Testament? Persons of far greater learning, and authority in the Church, have made use of several others; I hope you will say not impertinently when I give you their names. That of *Aaron* and *Miriam* has been thought by some not wholly unfit to illustrate the nature of Schism: they taking occasion from the infirmity of *Moses*, to lessen his authority, and to raise their own; (as Mr. Ainsworth) intending no doubt to draw the people from him. And therefore their sin is called *Emulation* by *Clemens Romanus*, and by him applied to the latter Schism of the *Corinthians*, as Schism is usually the child and companion of *Emulation*, which made the *Corinthians* Schismatics, and their Leaders to break communion with, and to rebel against their lawful Presbyters, as *Aaron* and *Miriam* did against *Moses*, and the people of *Israel*: themselves are taught subjection to the Priests, and Levites; lest God should do to them as he did to *Miriam*, *Deut.* 24. 8, 9. inflict the same punishment for the like fault. From which reasoning in St. *Clemens*, it is plain he reckoned Schism in the Church, to be like Sedition in the State, something more than barely a breach of Charity. That of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, was urged by the *Donatists* your Predecessors against the Catholics, who did not disown the way of arguing, but only set the instances right by comparing *Jannes* and *Jambres* with the *Donatists*, and the Church with *Moses* whom they withstood. And St. Paul did not think to slightly of this instance, when he alledged it in his 1st. Epistle to *Timothy*, against the Gnostic Schismatics; who led captive silly women laden with sins, who did not only break charity, but resisted the truth. *1 Tim.* 3. 6, 7, 8. That of *Korah*, *Dathan* and *Abiram*, is thought fit to be used by St. *Jude*, v. 11. concerning the Gnostic Separatists, v. 9. By St. *Clemens* against the *Corinthians*. By *Optatus* against the *Donatists*, calling 'em their wretched Masters, the dividers of the people, the Masters of the first Schism, the Schismatics, viz. your Masters, &c. And

Ains. in loc.

Vid. opi. l. 7.

Vid. Hammond
in loc.
Clem. Rom. p.
110.
Optat. cont. Parm.
l. 6. p. 167.

And yet to Mr. *M. H.* it does not occur. These instances and many more of the like sort produced by St. *Clement*, and others, as that of *Cain* and *Abel*, *Jacob* and *Eson*, *Joseph* and his Brethren, *Moses* and the quarrelling *Hebrew*, &c. tho' not all of them designed to run upon all four, as the *Vindicator* speaks p. 40. Yet being alledged against Schismatics, are intended some to shew the mischiefs of *Emulation* and faction, which are always the ingredients of Schism; Others more nearly to signify the pernicious nature and heinous guilt, of making parties, in opposition to lawful authority; or to contend with them that are truly our Superiors in the Church, and by this way of arguing we may learn, that according to the sentiments of those primitive worthies, Schismatics are guilty of *Emulation*, which must necessarily be betwixt divided parties, and Interests, and consequently where there is Schism there is likewise a breach of Communion. And secondly that it is in opposition to our Ecclesiastical Governors. This must necessarily be the Sense of those who use this way of reasoning, but neither of these things could be imputed to *Eldad* and *Medad*; and therefore their notion of Schism could not be the same with Mr. *M. H.*'s, and that is (I suppose) the reason why he neither makes use of their Instances, nor they of his.

By his exception against those Texts, which obliged the *Jews* to worship, (as he says) only in one place, viz. at *Jerusalem*. And to offer only upon that Altar; a man will be apt to conclude him extremely ignorant in the Religion of the *Jews*, and the mystical reasonings upon which it was built. To say nothing as yet of our own, how far it has any relation to it. He supposes first of all, that the *Jews* were bound to worship at one place, viz. at *Jerusalem*, and secondly, that this obligation is vacated by that Gospel rule which bids us to pray every where, Enq. p. 3. Which two things if they be true (as he supposes) then the Male *Jews* never prayed at all, but when they came to *Jerusalem*, viz. 3 times a Year, at the Feast of Unleavened bread, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles; which methinks is a very scandalous account of the *Jewish* devotion, but the whole assertion is false. The *Jews* had their *Profeuchæ* every where without the Cities, their Synagogues within, the Tabernacle was at *Shiloh*, there was an Altar at Mount *Ebal*; *Samuel* sacrificed at *Mispeh*, and in *Zuph*, in *Gilgal*, and in *Bethlehem*; *Elijah* at Mount *Carmel*. They had their daily Sacrifices of the Sabbaths, and of the new Moons. Nor is it easy to imagine that they should all go once a week from the most distant places to *Jerusalem*, unless they had very little business at home, or were extraordinary Travellers. They had their *Profeuchæ* and Synagogues for publick worship, and their private devotions which might be said any where. All inferior Altars and places of worship were in communion with the supream one; and the persons who did legally and regularly communicate at them, were like-

Mod. Enq. p. 3.

Ibid.

Ibid.

wife understood to partake thereby of that one Altar, and therefore if the *Synagogues* be certainly the patterns of our *Christian Assemblies*, pray Sir assign us an Altar with which we must hold communion, which will surely be that of the Bishop according to the sentiments of the primitive Church.

Nor was the precept of offering only upon one Altar so purely ceremonial, but that it was founded upon very rational, tho' mystical principles, according to the sense and interpretation of the Hellenistical *Jews*; the end of it was to distinguish the *Segullah*, or peculiar people; those that were in special Union, and Covenant with the Deity, from those that were not or had broken off from it.

The principle and archetypal head of that Union was God himself, to whom none but the *Segullah* were united. The *Segullah* were united by Sacraments, which were the legal Symbols and Ratifications of that Union, the High Priest was the representative of the Archetypal head, so that none could be in Union with God, unless united to the High Priest: None united to the High Priest unless they did partake of that Altar where he offered, and those which were dependant upon it. And therefore the Sacraments belonging to Schismatical Altars, viz. that of *Samaria* and its dependents, erected in opposition to that of the true High Priest, did not unite them to God, neither consequently were the Worshippers at that Altar to be reckoned of the *Segullah*, or peculiar people; but rather as the Altar of *Samaria* was against the Altar of *Jerusalem*, so were the *Samaritan* worshippers against the true *Israelites*.

Now the Christians I hope are as well united to the Father and the Son as ever the *Jews* were. They are as truly the *Segullah*, or peculiar people, and the ways of transacting that Union by the Evangelical Sacraments and Priesthood as certain. And therefore have been maintained by the Primitive Fathers and Mr. *Dodwell*, upon the same manner of reasonings which the *Jews* used.

And if this way of reasoning be good, there are two other Texts in the old Testament, which will help to discover the notion of Schism; one relating to that Altar of the Tribes beyond *Jordan*, *Joshuah* 22, the other to those of *Jeroboam*, 2 *Kings* 17.

Nor is any thing in this foolish paragraph conclusive against these reasonings, which it was either designed to Answer, or else it is very impertinent. No man ever denied that Christians might pray every where, in any Kingdom, City, or place wheresoever they come, only we desire it may be remembered that the *Jews* had the same liberty. And if private Christians may pay their devotion to Almighty God any where, in the Church, in their Families, in their Closets, in the Fields, and any other place; they certainly have the liberty to pray every where; and yet this cannot vacate the obligation of holding communion with one Altar, for the *Jews* themselves had the very same liberty while

See his one Altar.

while they were under that obligation. If Christians have a liberty to build their Oratories, and Churches for the public service of Almighty God, whereſoever they pleaſe, without being excluded, or confined to any place; they may certainly fulfil the *Gospel rule of praying every where*, and yet this will be no prejudice to their holding Communion with the Biſhop of the Dioceſs.

For if uniting our ſelves to a Congregation in communion with the Biſhop, be any violation of that *Gospel rule*; becauſe they meet in a particular Church and the Biſhop lives in a particular City; I cannot ſee how Mr. H. and his Vindicator, will acquit themſelves from the ſame guilt, whoſe Congregations are confined to a particular houſe, or a particular ſtable. Their people muſt be with their Teacher where ever he aſſembles, ours with their Priſt at the place of publick worſhip. And if we are to be condemned for breaking this *Gospel rule*; I can ſee no reaſon why Mr. H. and his followers ſhould plead not guilty.

It is true we are not confined to that one Altar at *Jeruſalem*, the obligation was taken away by the authority of our Saviour, *Joh. 4. 21.* in his anſwer to the woman of *Samaritan*: *The hour cometh when ye ſhall neither in this Mountain, nor yet at Jeruſalem worſhip the Father.* Not that it was forbidden to worſhip at either of thoſe places, in the times of the *Gospel*; but the true Evangelical worſhip ſhould not be confin'd to either, the Jewiſh diſpenſation was to be laid aſide, and a more ſpiritual one introduc'd; the literal to be exchanged for the myſtical. *Iſrael*: *The hour cometh and now is when the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father, in ſpirit and in truth, for the Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip him. God is ſpirit; and they that worſhip him, muſt worſhip him in ſpirit, and in truth.* *verſ. 23, 24.* That which under the *Gospel* was to anſwer the High Priſthood, ſhould not be confin'd to one City, or one Mountain, and that which correſponded to the worſhip ſhe then diſcourſed of, namely the ſharing in the ſame Sacrifices, ſhould be henceforth ſo ſpiritual, and free, that all people might partake and communicate in it, however diſtant their reſidences were, which they could not do before. This, as it is the genuine ſenſe of our Saviour's diſcourſe; ſo methinks theſe following obſervations may be drawn from it. 1^{ſt}, That there is ſomething under the *Gospel*, which does really correſpond to that ſolemn worſhip at *Jeruſalem*; for it being that only which the woman diſcourſed of to our Saviour; his anſwer muſt neceſſarily bear a relation to it. And therefore the worſhip at *Jeruſalem*, and the ſpiritual worſhip, were a type, and antitype one of another. So that as all the Jews did communicate at one Altar, in the like manner Chriſtians muſt partake in the ſame ſpiritual Sacrifices. 2^{dly}, That as the deſign of thoſe anniverſaries was to keep 'em in the ſame Communion; ſo the ſpiritual worſhip here ſpoken of is for the very ſame end. 3^{dly}, That as the Priſthood and

Altar

Altar were the principles of unity amongst them, so there is a mystical Priesthood and Altar, which do the same thing among us. ^{4thly} That as he who broke the communion with that Altar, was off from the Church of the Jews; So he who separates from ours is divided from the body of Christians. And ^{5thly} That as in one case they forfeited the Jewish privileges, so they do likewise the Christian in another. These two last observations were included in the discourse, as is plain from our Saviours confining Salvation to the Jews: For the conclusion bearing a relation to all the premises, the true worshippers under the Gospel, are parallel with those under the Law. And therefore as Salvation was of the Jews, and belonged only to those who did worship at *Jerusalem*; so likewise Salvation under the Gospel, must for the same reason, be confined to the spiritual Worshippers; that is to those who are united to the one Christian Altar, as the Jews were to that of *Jerusalem*, and by the same parity of reason all others excluded. So that I can see no cause why Mr. H. should conclude, that *the binding of the Jews to communicate at one Altar, is nothing to us*. For if we are under a parallel obligation to do the same thing, to preserve that unity in the spirit, which they did in the letter. If the Jewish Church was a representation of the Christian, and their Altar, and Priesthood a type of ours: Surely something is to be learned by us from what they did. Unity and Communion is something more than a Ceremony, and Schism which is the breach of it is I suppose the same thing in the Christian, that it was under the Jewish Oeconomy. St. Paul is pleased to argue from the Jewish precedents, for the right of maintenance; that they who minister about *holy things* live of *the things of the Temple*, they which wait at the Altar should be partakers with the Altar, and that even so both the Lord ordained, that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel. Plainly supposing that our Clergy answers the Levitical Priesthood, our Churches their Temple, our Communion Table their Altar, and that what was thought equal in their case in the provisions of the old Testament, is for that very reason to be taken for ordained in the case of the Gospel Ministry: there being no other Evangelical ordinance. And why we may not argue from Jewish precedents in the case of Schism, having the Apostles example for it in case the of maintenance, I cannot understand. St. Paul argues from the Aaronical, to the Melchizedechian Priesthood; from the Priesthood of mortal men, to the immortal Priesthood of the Son of God; from the rights of the literal, to those of the mystical Altar; and tells us that the Law was a Schoolmaster to bring us to Christ; and yet Mr. M. H. is so apt a Scholar, that in one of the most eminent and principal instances, he can find nothing to his purpose.

Mr. Dodw. one Altar.

Vid. Mr. Dod. one Alt. p. 23.

Sigon: de Rep.
Heb. l. 2. c. 8.

The Synagogues Mr. H. allows were the patterns of Christian Assemblies, but not the Temple, p. 3. I should rather have thought the Synagogues,

and

and Temple too; especially if we believe the account which *Sygenius* gives; in which he is follow'd by other learned men; viz. That Synagogues were first erected in the time of the Captivity; that they who wanted the Temple to pray and teach in might have some place like the Temple, in which they might assemble to perform that sort of duty. Now Mr. H. tells us that Synagogues were the patterns of Christian Assemblies: *Sygenius* that they were like and instead of the Temple, and therefore any man would believe that the Christian Assemblies and the Temple being both like the Synagogue, were also like one another: and consequently the Temple as well as the Synagogue the pattern of Christian Assemblies.

But I suppose Mr. H. dares not allow the Temple to be a pattern for fear of the Altar, and the *Vindicator* we find is for *Prophets* rather than *Priests*; p. 41. The *Priests* (he tells us) were engag'd principally in the Ceremonial, but the *Prophets* in the Moral part of Worship; which was discovering the Mind of God to the People, and pressing them to Obedience: and it is to this rather, than the Priestly Office, that a Gospel Minister succeeds, *ib.* So that according to this Gentleman, Preaching is the whole business of a Christian Minister, and Prayers and Sacraments, which are the work of a Priest, are to pass for Cyphers, and Religious Impertinencies. Our Author might have considered, that the Spirit of Prophecy, so long as it lasted, did accompany the Priesthood; and when at last the Scribes succeeded in the place of the Prophets, *Exra* himself was both Priest and Scribe, and accordingly prepared his heart to teach Gods Precepts and Judgments in Israel; *Exr. 7. 10.* and (the Prophecy that sometimes accompanied the High Priesthood) seems to outlive all the rest, as appears from the instance of *Caiaphas*, who foretold the death of our Saviour; And, as the Apostle declares, *his* spoke be not of himself, but being High Priest that same year, he prophesied, *John 11. 51.* So that Prophecy and Priesthood being united in the same person, if the Gospel Minister succeeds to the one, why not to the other? or if he succeeds to the Jewish Prophets, why not to such as were Priests, as well as Laymen? or if only to the Laymen, pray who were the persons after Prophecy ceased among them, to whom the Gospel Minister succeeded? or had he no Representative at all? perhaps you will say it was the Scribe, who being Interpreter of the Law, was for that reason a Type of the Gospel Minister, like as the Synagogue where he taught was of Christian Assemblies. And thence we may infer, That the Scribe and the Synagogue are as like Mr. H. and his Congregation, as two Beans; and yet I am afraid the Synagogue will not suit his purpose, any more than the Temple; the *Archisynagogue* will spoil his Pattern, as well as the High Priest: For as there is no such an Officer in the independent way, so both the Ordination and Government of the inferior Scribes belonging to him, he so far resembles one of our Bishops, that I fancy Mr. H. and his *Vindicator* will neither of them like him.

The

The Instance of *Eldad* and *Ahidab*, and Mr. H's Opinion of the Old Testament being thus far considered; let us now attend him into the new, for there he tells us *the special Enquiry lies*, p. 6. And the Enquiry he there makes, is after *the signification of the word Schism*; and the Reason he gives for so doing, is because *words*, as he tells us, *are the significations of things*; Whether there be not a little Non-sense in this weighty Reason, (which he lays as the foundation of his notable Enquiry) I refer to the captious, being willing rather to excuse it in a Man of his parts.

But he must pardon me; if I make bold to search more strictly into his ground-work; 'tis in kindness to the Superstructure, which will not abide a Storm, if the Foundation be sandy. That Mr. H's is so, will appear, if we consider, that altho' words do signify things, yet one word does not always signify only one thing; neither is the same thing always signified by the same word. And therefore as *gloua* may have several meanings; so other words in the new Testament, may express the nature of Schism, as well as that, or at least help us to understand, the true meaning of it. Thus Mr. H. himself interprets *gloua* by *Verbi*, p. 14. St. Paul by *edris* also and *Chor* and *Oratoria*. St. Jude calls the Schismatics *ἀσπασίας* *ἀσπασίας*, v. 19. St. John tells us, *ἡμεῖς ἰσχυροί*, 1 Joh. 2. 19. And there are several other terms, and passages in the new Testament relating to Schism, which methinks ought not to have been omitted, by one that pretends to give us a clear and a full account.

And as Mr. H. is defective in his inquiry, by reason of his slighting all those passages, so neither is he exact in his interpretation of the words, *gloua* and *ἀσπασίας*, you have the various meanings of 'em in a literal sense, viz. taken for a rent, and rending and cleaving, and breaking, but little to the purpose, as he tells you, p. 6, 7. If it makes but little, yet that little is something, which Mr. H. ought not to have passed over in silence, and another man will suppose that it makes a great deal; for as in the literal sense, it imports a separation of parts, the rending, or breaking, or cleaving of one body into two; So likewise in the Ecclesiastical there is something equivalent meant by it, viz. the dividing of Christ's body, the Church, and making two of that Society, which ought to be united in one: which is most visibly done by separation and breach of Communion.

Secondly, He says it is used figuratively for a division; and that two fold, viz. 1st, A division in apprehension; and 2^d, A division in affection. These two parts of it being the necessary ingredients of his description, but if there should be no real ground for this figurative distinction, if the places he has quoted for the difference in apprehension, may as well be understood concerning difference in affection; and so on the contrary, or if something more is to be found in 'em relating to this affair, than what Mr. H. has noted; then I suppose we may rea-

reasonably demure to his clear and full account. The Texts he cites for a *division in apprehension* are, *Job. 7. 43. d. 9. 16. c. 10. 19. and Ait. 23. 19.* Now let any man look into his Bible, and examine these passages, and I believe the meanest capacity will easily discover a great deal more than barely a *division in apprehension*. See *Job. 7.* and there you will find the Sanhedrim, and their Officers, and the people divided about our Saviour. Among the people, some cry him up, as that Prophet, and the Christ; others object against it, *but shall Christ arise out of Galilee?* &c. Among the Officers some were for taking him, others against it. In the Sanhedrim one party chide the Officers for not bringing him, *Mat. 26. 45.* reckoning them *seduced by him*, *v. 47.* and the people *curst*, *v. 49.* Nicodemus to be of *Galilee* (which was then a term of reproach) because tho one of the Sanhedrim, yet he was secretly his disciple, and stood up for him against them all, *v. 51.* Now here was not only a diversity of opinion, but a dividing into parties; a struggling of Interests; a battling of authority; a censuring and reviling of those that were for our Saviour, as *denied, received and accused*, and *Galileans*. Whether here was not a division in affection, and what is more, a division and breaking into parties, as well as a division in apprehension; let Mr. H. himself judge; or the Vindicator for him, in case he is not able, *utram ad id quodvis*.

After the same manner he deals with *Job. 90.* Where we read of a dissension among the multitude, concerning our Saviour occasioned by his curing the blind man. Some contending that he *was not of God*, because he *broke the Sabbath*; others, that he *was not a sinner*, because he *did such Miracles*. The Man and his Parents were both of our Saviour's party, but the Parents durst not expressly own him to be the Messiah, *for fear of the Jews*. I Pray, Sir, what were they afraid of? Was it lest they should differ in apprehension? the Text tells us otherwise. It was because the Jews had ordained, That if *any man did confess that he was the Christ, he should be excommunicated out of the Synagogue*, was to be turned both out of sacred and civil communion, and accordingly the Son himself was so used as we find (*Mat. 13. 34.*) for daring and persisting in that acknowledgment. Now where the one party were so incensed against them that owned our Saviour, and the other so zealous in their belief, as to argue for him notwithstanding the odium and trouble which thereby they might incur, to call a dissension betwixt these parties, only a difference in apprehension, has something in it peculiar to Mr. H. The dissensions betwixt private men may perhaps pass under that cold title, but the dissensions of parties and multitudes, (especially where people dispute warmly against the sense and interest of a Government, as those who took part with our Saviour, in the Jews opinion, did) for the most part signifies a great deal more. And should there have been such a dissension in behalf of King Charles the Second, or the Church of Eng-

And when the Independents were uppermost, the poor Malignants would have felt more than barely a difference of apprehension. And their Taskmasters would soon have interpreted it to be the making of parties; how far the cases are parallel, let the Reader consider.

The next place he alledges for *division in apprehension*, is *John 8. 19.* and altho' some went so far as to cry out against our Saviour, that he is mad; and hath a Devil, which expressions could hardly be used without some warmth and resentment, as well as reproach and bitterness against those who owned him to be the Christ. Yet Mr. H. is so very ingenious, as to apply it only to *division in apprehension*, and to exceed in modesty as to impose his mistaken sense (without so much as offering at any proof) upon the rest of mankind.

Having done with *John 8.*, he falls next upon *John 8.*, which he says is used in the same sense, *Acts 23. 7.* Here the Pharisees and Sadducees were divided about St. Paul, *ἡ πόλις ἰερουζαλὴμ ἡ πόλις ἡ ἑβραϊκή καὶ ἡ ἑλληνική*; there arose a dissention or an uproar, (for so the word may signify), and the multitude was divided, and altho' the dissention was carried on with the cry of the people, and the strivings of the Pharisees, with so much noise and tumult, that the chief Captain was at last afraid, lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them; yet this dividing of the multitude according to Mr. H.'s clear account, did signify no more, but only *division in apprehension*.

Suppose a man should have said the same thing concerning the *dissention* at the *Boine*, about K. William and K. J. wherein the multitude was likewise divided; whether it would have been ingenious, or ridiculous, let Mr. Vindicator judge. 'Tis true, the Sadducees had had great Guns, nor did the Pharisees run away; neither do we read of any mighty General that lost his life, yet there was *sedition*, *ἡ πόλις ἰερουζαλὴμ ἡ πόλις ἡ ἑβραϊκή καὶ ἡ ἑλληνική* in both cases, and St. Paul's life was in very great danger as well as King William's; it was *sedition*, *2. 7.* and but *sedition*, *2. 10.*

Now I suppose any one might conclude from all the aforesaid Texts, that the words *sedition* and *ἡ πόλις ἰερουζαλὴμ ἡ πόλις ἡ ἑβραϊκή καὶ ἡ ἑλληνική* do import a *division in affection*, as well as in *apprehension*; or something more than either, or both of them together; namely, the dividing of the people into contrary parties; and therefore Mr. H. is neither ingenious, nor fair, in restraining the words only to one sense, which are so capable of several, even in those very passages which he himself cites. If other people would have been as hasty and as fanciful as Mr. H. to infer a notion of Schism from the English of a word, and that again understood and expounded, as themselves please, without taking in the sense of the context to which it relates, they might have made short work on't, in proving Mr. H. and his Vindicator both Schismatics: for if *Schisma* be *dissention*, as it is rendered in these texts, *Schismatici* are *dissenters*; as these Gentlemen call themselves; and so the business is done.

Accor-

According to his ingenuity in expounding these Texts, he draws his inference from them; viz. *That this diversity of opinion, judgment, or apprehension, cannot be call'd or look'd upon in it self, a thing criminal; inas-much as there are many things which (either because they are dark and obscure and so not capable of demonstration, or because they are trivial and of light moment, and so not worth a demonstration) is it no matter what opinion men are of concerning them, p. 7, 8.* Now I would ask Mr. H. whether this paragraph relates to the aforementioned Texts or not? If not, then he might as well have told us his own opinion, with out quoting them: it receiving no authority or confirmation from them: and therefore should not have been obtruded upon the World, under the pretext and umbrage of Scripture, but I suppose he intended it as a position, grounded upon the aforesaid Texts, as appears from his calling it *this diversity*; which pronoun relative *This*, must refer to the Antecedent Texts, and his own paraphrase, and exposition of them; and if so, it is one of the slickest Libels upon our Saviour, and St. Paul, and their believing Friends, and one of the best apologies for the Jews and Sadduces their Enemies, that I have lately met with. For if it were a thing so dark and obscure, or so trivial and light, that the difference was no way criminal, either on one side or other, if it were no matter what opinion men had of our Saviour and St. Paul, no matter whether they believ'd the resurrection, or denied it; no matter whether people took our Saviour for the Messias, or a mad man; no matter what became of Christ and his great Apostles; or if these things were so obscure and dark, and their ignorance about them so very invincible, the Jews surely were not much to be blam'd for any thing they did; nor the believers much to be commended for making such a pother about things of such small concernment, or at least so dark and obscure, that they could no way demonstrate whether they did right or not. This must needs be the consequence of this paragraph, if it relates to the former; and yet I am willing to excuse Mr. M. H. from it, having the charity rather to believe that he knew not what he said.

I shall not trouble my self much about his pretty sayings, p. 8. tho' perhaps it might justly be enquired, *Whether Heresy does not always include Schism?* Whether Evil does not sometimes happen from the diversity, as well as the erroneoufness of Opinions? Whom he means by the *Worshippers of the Diana of their own Opinions, and the Sottish*; Whom by the *Saines*; and whether Mr. H. is not a *Schismatic*, according to his own Notion, by the uncharitable and partial Insinuations of his 3^d, 4th, and 5th Paragraphs, in the last of which sure he means some body, when he talks of a great strangeness to the Spirit of the Gospel. The Disciples of St. John Baptist (he tells you) were hugely displeased, because Christ's Disciples did not fast so often as they did, and quarrell'd with Christ himself about it, Mat. 9. 14. Now all that those Disciples did, was to ask our Saviour a question in calm and proper terms, without

any token of the least displeasure that I can find, viz. *Why do we, and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy Disciples fast not?* ib. And there was so much reason for that Enquiry, (considering how much Religion they placed in Fasting, and what a good opinion they had of our Saviour, and how hard it was for them to reconcile the practice of his Disciples, with the Character which their Master had given of him) that a Man would wonder how it came to enter into Mr. H's head, that John's Disciples were angry. Surely Mr. M.H. is of a very tender constitution, if he thinks that he who asks him a question, must necessarily be displeased, and quarrel with him. But if John's Disciples were so hugely displeased, and did really quarrel with our Saviour, when they ask'd him that question, surely there was a *division in Affection*, as well as in *Apprehension*: and therefore this Text, as well as the rest, might have been urged under that Head.

Neither is the Case at all so applicable to the *Dissenters* and us, as Mr. H. would make it: The Fasting and Abstinence of John's Disciples, and the Pharisees, was arbitrary, and peculiar to their Sects, not enjoined by the *Jewish Church*; And, on the other hand, our Saviour had all Authority, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, (as he was both King and Priest) united in his Person. Now if in either of these Points, the Case of the *Dissenters* be parallel: If Mr. H. can shew that our Holy-days, &c. are only the private Institutions of a particular Sect, without the Authority and Sanction either of Church or State; or if he can make it appear that he is equal to our Saviour, that he is a Priest, and a King, or a God among his People, let him change the Customs among them as soon as he pleases; let 'em fast all *Christmas*, and carouze all *Lent*, and go contrary in every thing to the *Rubrick* and *Canon*, provided [they have as much reason for their thoughts and practices, as we have for ours,] which (with submission to Mr. H.) we could never yet see.

Thus much I shall freely grant him, that in case there arises a difference betwixt private persons, such as Mr. H. and I, about matters of Religion, (I should be but a *fancy Procrustes*, if I should go about to appoint the length of him;) but if Authority thinks fit to call him to the Standard, he is undoubtedly a Subject, and I know no reason why he should not go as well as I. Some People have not forgotten, since they of his Party did usurp *Moses's Chair*: how zealous they were for drawing up every body to their own pitch; not only those that were in Covenant, but those that were out: insomuch that if your size were too small, and you could not stretch, it would be next doot to hanging before they had done with you. And notwithstanding the smoothness and love which Mr. H. personates in this Book, yet there is still so much roughness and spite, (which he could not hide, and which the *Vindicator* openly boasts of) in his rude usage of *P.W.* as makes me often pray, that I may never stand in need of either of these Mens Charity.

We

We come now to consider the second sense of the word *ἁίσμα*, and a Man would have thought by this time it had been half construed, but you must examin three places in 1 Cor. and thence you may be furnished with a true Notion of Schism, p. 9. Now if I had been as Mr. H. I would have scratcht out all the former Impertinence; for if here be the true Notion, what's all this stuff for before? But then the little Book had been a great deal less than it is.

Just now you must look into three places for the true Notion of Schism, but (*Hocum-Pocum*) turn over the Leaf, and you have it in one of them, 1 Cor. 1. 10. *I beseech you Brethren — that there be no divisions, (ἁίσμα) no Schisms among you.* And for the understanding of *ἁίσμα*, you must observe this method, i. e. First of all, *You must enquire into the exegetical Exhortations that accompany it.* And secondly, *Into the Corinthians miscarriage, which occasioned this Caution,* p. — The exegetical Exhortations are, First, *That ye all speak the same thing, viz in the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity,* as he understands St. Paul; but then he tells us from himself, and *Estim* (one of those who de-
bauched the New Testament with their Popish Annotations) *That in little things it can never be made a Duty to be of the same Opinion, since it is morally impossible.* Now, for my part, I can see no more impossibility for Men to be of the same Opinion in little things, than in great. There is but one truth (and one best) in both. Their nature is as plain, and it is as easy to me to find out my Duty with relation to Ceremonies, as it is rightly to apprehend the great Mysteries of the Incarnation, and Trinity, and therefore I know no reason why I may not agree with other People in little things, as well as in great. A Table-gesture is a little thing, and yet I suppose Mr. H. believes, that our Saviour himself made it a Duty to use it at the Sacrament. It would be pretty to see him demonstrate, according to his own Rule, that it is morally impossible that we who now think otherwise, should ever be of the same Opinion: and consequently, that our Saviour could never make it our Duty. If the Gentleman were better acquainted with Ecclesiastical History, he would find that whole Churches and Nations had their peculiar Customs and Ceremonies, and yet their Members agreed well enough in their Opinions about the things he calls little, while they had no such People as he to disturb their Peace.

He bids us observe, *That St. Paul does not oblige us to think the same thing, but (tho' your thoughts be divers) yet speak the same thing, (i. e.) in your Preaching and Converse, speak of those things only wherein you are agreed.* I observed before from Mr. H. that they were to speak the same things only in the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity; and if he will allow me to lay these two Observations together, the Sense will be thus, viz. you are not obliged to think the same thing, (i. e.) to be of the same opinion in the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity; and in your Preaching and Converse, take care to speak of those things only wherein

See Bishop Ov.
Convoc. Book,
p. 226.

E

wherein you are agreed; and as for the rest of the *Fundamentals*, you may let them alone, (i.e.) according to Mr. H. do not fall out, and fight about them. As if there were no difference betwixt mere silence, and falling out, and fighting: But tho' Mr. H. may preach *Fundamentals* according to this *Gnostic Rule*, I am sure that St. Paul himself followed a contrary practice, or else he might have saved himself the trouble of many sharp persecutions, as well as a great deal of pains in this *Epistle*.

Secondly, That ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment; which (says he) must be understood of a serious endeavor after it, for otherwise a perfect conjunction must be reserved for a world of everlasting perfection. If Mr. H. had but lookt into his Greek Testament, and duly considered the *Original*, perhaps he would have found no great reason for this *Interpretation*. The words of St. Paul are, *ἡμεῖς καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γνώμῃ*, Be ye compassed, or knit together in the same mind and opinion. For *καταρτίζων*, is in the literal Notion, to compass, or knit together, either the members of a body, or the parts of a building, &c. So Exod. 15. 17. *καταρτίσεις ἐκ καταρτίων*, Psal. 40. 6. *σώμα καταρτίσω μοι*, and as Mr. H. observes, that *ἰσίδω* is used for the breaking of a Net, John 21. 11. So *καταρτίζοντες τὰ δίχτυα αὐτῶν*, is, in English, mending their Nets, Mat. 4. 21. And as *ἰσίδω*, and *καταρτίζονται* are opposed in the literal sense, so *χρισματα* and *καὶ σισυμβολοί* are by St. Paul in the Ecclesiastical.

Nor were the *Corinthians* all agreed in the great Gospel Truths, as Mr. H. ignorantly supposes, p. 11. The *Resurrection* is surely to be numbered among the great Gospel-Truths, and yet many of the *Corinthians* denied it, which gave occasion to St. Paul so strenuously to assert it in the 15th Chapter of this first *Epistle*, and St. Clemens *Romanus* in his. That *Marriage* is lawful, and *Fornication* otherwise, are (I suppose) considerable Gospel-Truths: And yet the *Corinthian Schismatic* allowed and practised *Fornication*, even such as was condemned by the generality of the *Heathens*, and no where scarce in use, (except among the brutish *Arabs*) viz. That a Man should have his Fathers wife, cap. 5. 1. And yet this done by a Doctor of some Church in *Achaia*, within the *Corinthian Precinct*, according to St. Chrysostom and Theodoret, ὁ μόνον Θεῶν μυστηρίων ἡγεῖτο ἀλλὰ καὶ διδασκαλικὴ ἐπιτέλεια χερσὶν αὐτοῦ: Not only admitted to be a partaker of the *Divine Mysteries*, but likewise he had obtained the dignity of a Doctor. And altho' some of those ancient Heretics could dispense with *Fornication*, yet they dissuaded People from *Marriage*, teaching them that it was of the Devil. That we ought to own our Saviour in times of the greatest persecution, is a great Gospel-Truth, Luke 12. 9. and yet the *Corinthian Schismatic* taught and practis'd otherwise, (which Doctrine and Practice, St. Paul is likewise thought to oppose, chap. 3. ver. 11, &c.) and went so far as to partake of the *Idol Sacrifices* according to their worldly wisdom, that they

Clem. Rom. p. 60. &c. Κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπῶνται, πῶς ὁ Θεὸς ποτε ἐκτίσεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀνακατασκευάζων, &c.

Vid. Chrysost. & Theodoretum in locum.

Vid. Hammond. in cap. 7. v. 1.

they might escape persecution, which made the Apostle argue that point, *cap. 8.* and to determin so peremptorily and severely, *cap. 10. 21.* *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils; Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils.*

I might give you several other instances of the Gnostick heresy, (too rise at that time in the Corinthian Church) but these surely are sufficient to prove against Mr. H. that they were not all agreed in the great Gospel-Truth. Now Heresy includes Schism as it breaks the unity of the Faith, one of the indispensable requisites to the unity of the Church. And therefore the Corinthian Hereticks being Schismatics likewise (i. e.) disjointed, and loose from the body of the Church, the Apostle bids 'em be *unconnected*, well-jointed and compacted in the Church. Again, in the same mind, and in the same judgment (i. e.) by uniting themselves to it both in affection and principles, a work surely to be done while men are in this world; and if it be not, Mr. H. will find it too late when he enters into another.

I have only two things further to note under this particular. First, That the Apostle charging the *Corinthians* to be perfectly join'd together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, or opinion (*ἑνὸς γνώμης*); it is strange how Mr. H. could observe that they were not obliged to think the same things. And secondly, That this Text relating so plainly to difference in apprehension, even according to his own exposition, it is no less unaccountable to me, why it might not as well have been reduced under that head, as any one of those which he alledged to that purpose.

Secondly, We must enquire into the *Corinthians* miscarriage which occasioned this caution, which, he tells us, we have, *v. 11, 12.* There were contentions among them, *v. 11.* Now the contention was about their Ministers, as Mr. H. assures us, *p. 11.* But I would ask him, first of all, was there no miscarriage antecedent to that contention? Yes surely, their heretical and wicked opinions which occasioned the antecedent caution. That ye all speak the same things. In these the Schism was founded, and they were probably the occasion of their ascribing themselves to *Paul*, and *Apollos*, and *Cephas*, and *Christ*. For where difference in opinion occasions debates among people, not only the merits of the cause, but likewise the original of each party, and the means of knowing what they pretend to teach others are very frequently enquired into. Thus it was in our Saviour's case, when he taught something new and extraordinary, beyond the common rate of their ordinary Scribes; Whence hath this man this wisdom and these mighty works? Is not this the Carpenter's son? Is not his Mother called Mary, &c? And are not his Sisters all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things? *Mat. 13. 54, 55, 56.*

And

And there seems to be abundantly more occasion, for the like enquiry in the case of the *Corinthians*; as will appear, if we consider the circumstances of those early times, when this Epistle was written, especially what means of knowledge the *Corinthians* then had; and what proofs they might make use of to evince the truth or falshood of any Doctrine in debate.

They could not have the writings of the New Testament, (this Epistle being one of the first. And it may reasonably be conjectured (perhaps proved) that of that little which was then written, they had seen nothing. For neither in their Epistle to St. Paul, so far as St. Paul alludes to it, neither in his to them, is there the least intimation of any such thing. And yet in the Epistles to the *Thessalonians*, and the Gospel of St. Matthew (which were of a prior date) had they been in their hands, they might have found the resolution of some of those cases which they put to the Apostle, and therefore saved themselves the labour of that part of their appeal.

And as for the writings of the Old Testament, there were two sorts of errors, (not to mention any more) which were not easily confuted by their authority. One was touching the Doctrine of the Resurrection, which (altho it might be proved from the Old Testament, yet the Gnostics who denied it, may reasonably be supposed to have learnt from the Sadduces, some of their first Masters; how to evade those proofs; and as for the other Judaizing Doctrines, the Old Testament did so far seem to countenance them, that it was not likely that every *religius* should be able to prove it otherwise. And therefore it might become the skill and authority of the great Apostle himself to shew the contrary.

And as the *Corinthians* had not the assistance of the written rule, either for information, or proof, in these cases, so both must be derived from their Teachers; either in word or writing. For instruction (besides what they had learned from our Saviour and his Apostles) they had their Prophets and Evangelists continually among them, who being endued with the Spirit, were thereby qualified to instruct and educate the younger converts in the Doctrines of the Gospel, and from these the *Corinthians* received their common Instructions.

But as the Orthodox Prophets had their true inspirations, so the Heretical Teachers pretended to the same; and as the former had their true miracles for the confirmation of their Doctrines, so the latter had their *trials*, their lying wonders for the confirmation of theirs, to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. And that which made it still more difficult for the ordinary *Corinthians* to judge betwixt them, was, because both parties continued in the same communion: the Heretics not daring to go out (*i. e.*) to separate from the Church, till a considerable time after this, when many of the Apostles were dead.

Now

Now where both sides were equal in order, pretended to the same inspirations, the same miracles, and lived in the same communion: the proof of each Doctrine must depend upon the credit and authority of those persons from whom it was derived. If from Christ, it was the greatest; if from the Apostles, it was next; if from one of the first Converts (well learned in the Christian doctrines) highly approved and dignified by the Apostles, (as *Apollos* was) it was of the last great authority. Thus *St. Paul* recommends the authority of the household of *Stephanus*, as being the most early Converts in that Region, the first-fruits of *Achaia*, who having added themselves unto the Ministry of the Saints, I beseech you brethren (says he) that you submit your selves unto such, 1 Cor. 16. 15, 16. Therefore acknowledge ye them that are such, v. 18. Hereby plainly directing them which side to choose, viz. those that were of *Stephanus*, *Fortunatus*, and *Achimus*'s party, who took part with the Apostles, and consequently were Orthodox. So likewise he magnifies his own authority, as prior and greater than that of the first-fruits; telling them that he planted, Cap. 316. as the wise Master-builder, he had laid the foundation, v. 10. That although they had ten thousand Instructions in Christ, yet not many Fathers; for in Christ Jesus he had begotten them through the Gospel, c. 14. 15. So that having received their Christianity originally from him, they ought not to gainsay his doctrines, they might not oppose their first-fruits to his authority. The Colledge of their Prophets could not judge him. And as for those who were the *Arians*, and therefore said, they were of Christ (i. e.) had heard our Saviour themselves, and therefore pretended to have received their Doctrine from him, and were consequently of greater authority than the first-fruits, who received theirs only from the Apostles, yet these were not to be credited in opposition to *St. Paul*, who being chosen into the number of the select witnesses, no other witness that was not one of that number could be equal to him. Or if any man should oppose the authority of an Apostle, *St. Peter*, or any of the rest, against *St. Paul*'s, yet the Answer is easy: Is Christ divided? Can he make two men the Apostles of contrary doctrines? The Apostles and all other Orthodox Teachers must necessarily speak the same thing. They being labourers together with God, c. 3. 9. Ministers of Christ, Stewards of the mysteries, c. 4. 1. but can lay no other foundation than that is laid in Jesus Christ, c. 3. 11. and that only according to the word of the Lord. So that if men pretend the authority of *St. Paul* against those Doctrines that are really *St. Paul*'s, their pretences by this very argument are proved fictitious, and *St. Peter* could never be the Author of any such thing. Or if the *Arians* say they are of Christ, should pretend his authority against that which is truly *St. Paul*'s, yet the answer is the same: Is Christ divided? He chose out *Paul*, and gave him his Spirit to preach these doctrines, and therefore those *Arians* must

must necessarily be ye our Saviour, who cannot be supposed to make the Apostles Preachers of one Doctrine, and himself preach the contrary. And yet if any man should set up *Paul* against the true Doctrine of Christ, so as to make him the patron of their new Doctrines, because he had the authority of an Apostle, yet the answer is easy, *Is Christ divided?* He cannot have the authority of Christ to preach two contrary Doctrines, neither ought he to set up any Doctrine of his own against the Doctrine and Authority of Christ, which is the ground of that farther reasoning, *Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?* I thank God that I baptized none of you but *Crispus and Gaius* — and the household of *Stephanas*, lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name, c. 1. v. 13, 14, 15. Tho we are Stewards of the mysteries, have the authority of Apostles, and are accountable to no man save only to the Lord, c. 4. 4. yet this authority does not empower us to be the patrons of contrary doctrines, that we should preach to you one doctrine formerly, and now the contrary be obtruded upon ye under our names. It is required of Stewards that a man be found faithful, c. 4. 2. and therefore we who are such ought to be true to our Master, and consistent to our selves. So that if we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed, Gal. 1. 8. And that they might take the greater notice, he ingeminates the sentence, as we said before, so say I now again — If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed, Ibid. v. 9.

Now for the Orthodox to say they were of *Paul*, or *Apollos*, &c. (i. e.) that they received their doctrines from them, was the same thing then as to quote Scripture now, i. e. it was the utmost authority they could alledge. But when the Hereticks pretended to the same authority, the Orthodox had no way left but to appeal to the Apostle himself, that it might appear under his own hand, what his doctrine really was, and which party was in the right, and accordingly they dispatched their Letters to him, by *Stephanas*, &c. by whom likewise they received his answer in this Epistle concerning the things in debate.

So that it was the Heretical Gnosticks only (nor the Orthodox party) who are reprehended by the Apostle for saying, I am of *Paul*, &c. 'Twas necessary for them to alledge these great authorities, that they might counterpoize the Orthodox, who justly pretended to the same, this being one of the best ways of proof in an age of inspirations, while there was little or nothing written.

And accordingly we find it made use of by the succeeding Hereticks, till such times as the Canon of Scripture was collected, and made up, (which was the best part of a Century, at least, after the writing of this Epistle.) And when that was done, they could not easily forget the same artifice, but still vented their doctrines under the

the patronage of great names, so the *Ebionites* pretended to be the followers of *St. James*; the *Basilidians* of *St. Matthias*; *Basilides* himself of *Glaucias* (the hearer of *St. Peter*) *Valentinus* of *Theodades* (who was conversant with *St. Paul*, &c.) Sometimes they opposed the truth by pretended and false traditions, otherwhiles by spurious and supposititious writings, and at last by corrupting the very Text itself by their base interpolations.

Nor is it to be supposed that this was the practice only of the latter Heretics, you may trace it in *St. Paul's* second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, written several years before this 1st. to the *Corinthians* — That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled neither by Spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means, &c. 2 Thess. 2. 2, 3. Herein alluding to the pretended revelations, the false and spurious traditions of Heretical Teachers, and either some counterfeit Epistle urged under the Apostles name, or at least their corrupt glosses and interpretations of those words in the 1st. Epistle, c. 5. 2. and perhaps it may not be unreasonably conjectured, that it was a counterfeit Epistle, or at least that such practices were then in use, because the Apostle is so careful to give 'em a certain token in the close of this Epistle, whereby they might distinguish betwixt those that were genuine, and those that were otherwise: *The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle*, C. 3. 17.

And if this was the practice of the primitive Heretics, both before and after the writing of this Epistle to the *Corinthians*, we may reasonably suppose, that they did not wholly omit it at this time. And therefore I see no reason (but rather a great deal to the contrary) why any body should be blamed, for saying, *I am of Paul*, &c. save only those Hereticks.

'Tis not to be supposed that the *Orthodox* complained of themselves, for if they knew themselves herein faulty, they might easily have reformed, without ever acquainting the Apostle with it. And it is something remarkable, how *Clemens* Romanus* aggravates the latter Schism of the *Corinthians*, by extenuating this, *ἡ δὲ ἡμετέριος ἐκκλησία ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ ἔσχετο*, &c. But that siding was less criminal, for then ye took part with the Apostles, who had born their testimony, and a man highly approved by them, but now what kind of men are they that have turned you aside, &c. From which words it is plain, That as the latter Schismatics were all of a Party, so were the former: And therefore the being of *Paul* and *Apollos*, and *Cephas*, &c. is comprehended by *St. Clemens* under one *ἐκκλησία*.

So that according to the circumstances of those times, the reasonings of the Apostle, and the account of *Clemens Romanus*, they were all of one Party, whom the Apostle reprehends, for saying, *I am of Paul*, &c. The *Ἀλλόττας* among them (those who had leen and heard

* *Clem. Ep. ad Corinth. pag. 110. Edit. Lond. 1687.*

our Saviour) pretended to be of Christ, (i. e.) to have received theirs from St. Paul, and St. Peter; the elder *Converts*, among the rest, who had been baptized by *Apollos*, to derive theirs from him. So that the *Schism* of the *Corinthians* lay, in opposing the sound and orthodox *Doctors*, maintaining their wild *Heresies*, under the pretence and umbrage of these great names, and all other *Heretics*, who altho' they forsook not the Communion of the Church, yet making a Separation within it, and forming a Party against the truth, and opposing their *Orthodox* Governors, have been reputed *Schismatics* upon the very same account in all Ages.

Having thus far given an account of the *Corinthian Schism*, which will do but little service to Mr. H's Notion, let us now take a further view of his Enquiry, and consider how ingeniously he manages the matter. He tells you, That *Schisms* and *Contentions* are one and the same thing; as if *Schism* and *Contention* had been convertible terms, and every one that contends, tho' for the greatest Truths against the most pernicious *Heresies*, were for that reason a *Schismatic*. Mr. H. might as well, and as truly have said, That *Schisms* and *Factions* are the same thing, because St. Paul calls them like wise by that name: But, however, to lay the greater Emphasis upon the word *Contentions*, he adds, 'tis worth noting that *Clement* Romanus in that famous Epistle of his to the *Corinthians*, still calls *Schisms* *Verbes*, *Contentions*, Enq. p. 11. Now from this Note of Mr. H's, I hope he will give me leave to make another; which is, that Mr. M. H. never read that famous Epistle: For tho' *Verbes* be sometimes used in that famous Writer, yet *χίσμα* and *σχίσμα*, and *διχοστασία*, and several other words, by which St. *Clement* means *Schisms*, are brought in more frequently, but *Verbes* in the plural scarcely once in that whole Epistle: But Mr. H. being a modest, as well as an ingenious person, was, it seems, contented to steal a Note out of Mr. Pool's *Synopsis*, rather than undergo the drudgery and Greek of that famous Epistle.

As πείσκλησις,
p. 110. 116.
ἀλαζονεία,
ἀνταρσασία
ῥύσασθαι ἑνὴν,
p. 33. Οὐμολογῶ,
πολεμῶ, p.
108. Edit.
Lond. 1687.

'Tis strange how Mr. H. in the next Paragraph should say, The *Contention* was about their *Ministers*. Our Saviour was ascended up into Heaven long before this, and it would have been a strange wild fancy in any *Corinthian*, not to be contented with any other Minister excepting only him. If Mr. H's *Congregation* at the next Election of a Minister, should be divided into four Parties, and one of them be for *Christ*, and no one else, I fancy the rest would conclude, that either they were not right in their wits, or else that it is purely a trick to have none at all.

And besides, it would be hard for Mr. H. to assign any reason why any body should prefer *Paul*, or *Apollos*, or *Cephas*, before *Christ*. I always thought our Saviour might have had the preference. And among all the wild Opinions of that Age, I believe neither Mr. H. nor his *Vindicator* can name one *Heretic*, who ever professed himself to be for *Paul*, &c. rather than for *Christ*.

He

He tells you, *That he that was of Apollos, was as much a Schismatic as he that was of Paul*; which is very true, (tho' not for the reason which he gives.) They were all of one side, against the *Orthodox*. There being not four Parties among the *Corinthians*, as Mr. H. fancies, *St. Paul* himself makes but two, viz. the *Orthodox* and *Heretics*, as is plain from that part of his salutation, ver. 2. *To all that in every place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.*

He tells you, pag. 12. *That if one went to hear Paul, and another went to hear Apollos, that did not make a Schism*: no, nor if one communicated with Paul, and another with Apollos; which is certainly true: for it would have been no more *Schism* to hear and communicate, as aforesaid, than it would be among us to communicate with the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and the Bishop of *London*. But I would fain know of Mr. H. how they must at that time hear and communicate with *St. Paul*, who was then in *Asia*? how with *Christ*, who was then in *Heaven*?

There was no occasion for silencing either Apollos or Cephass, for they were of the same mind with *St. Paul*, and the other *orthodox Doctors*. And yet there might be occasion enough to silence some of the *Schismatical Teachers*, who made use of their Names, to give a reputation to their own *Heresies*; and accordingly you find the *Apostle* threatening them, 2 Cor. 13. 2. *Now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that if I come again I will not spare.* And in the 10th Verse, *Therefore I write these things being absent, lest being present I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath given me, &c.* which power was not only to silence, but to excommunicate those Teachers, and inflict that further punishment which then attended those Censures, and accordingly the incestuous Doctor was to be so dealt with by the *Apostle's* authority and order, 1 Cor. 5. 3, 4, 5. *to be delivered unto Satan, by being excommunicated out of the Church, for the destruction of the flesh, that Satan having him in his power, might torment his body with diseases and pains.*

For such a power as this the *Apostles* had, whereby they were more especially enabled to convict *Heretics* of *Imposture*, who pretending to *Miracles* as well as the *Apostles*, it was not easy for the common People to see which were in the right, unless something extraordinary appeared on the one side more than the other. And in this case nothing could be so proper, as that power of inflicting punishments upon the very persons of the Wonder-workers. They might equal the *Apostles* themselves in their pretences to *Inspirations*, to *Mystery*, and *Knowledge*. Their *Tricks* and *Conjurations* might perhaps seem as strange to the common People, as any true *Miracles*: But when the *Apostles* inflicted miraculous punishments, and yet they could neither save nor avenge themselves by all their power, it would be plain enough to every one, who it was that acted by the power of God, and

con-

consequently which side were in the right, and which *Cheats* and *Impostors*. Thus St. Paul threatens the elated *Gnostics*, to know their power, 1 Cor. 4. 19. *For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power, i. e.* it will not be so easy for you to judge by *disputations*, &c. who are the *orthodox members* of God's Church, as by these more evident demonstrations of power, which make the case plain to every man.

And yet the *Apostle* was always tender how he used those rigorous methods, this power being given for edification, and not for destruction, 2 Cor. 13. 10. it was only to be exerted upon the most notorious and incorrigible Offenders. And this is the reason why we meet with so few instances of it, and why the *Apostle* leaves it to their choice, how he should deal with them. *What will ye, shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness*, 1 Cor. 4. 21. And this power seems to be appropriate to the *Apostles*, and their Successors the *Bishops* of that early Age: For why else does the *Apostle* in the case of the incestuous Corinthian, affirm himself to be present in spirit at the meeting of the inferior Ministers of the Church. [When ye are gathered together.] What matter whether the *Apostle* were present any way or not, if his presence were no way necessary? why should his spirit with the power of Christ, be so emphatically mentioned, ver. 4. if the Assembly had that power of Christ, so as to do it without him; perhaps one reason might be, because the Corinthian was a Doctor.

And we find the same authority over persons of that degree, appropriated to the succeeding *Bishops*. So Timothy might bestow the marks of Honour, and likewise receive Accusations against an Elder, and rebuke them that sinned before all, so as to terrify others, 1 Tim. 5. 17, 19, 20. Titus was to rebuke sharply the *Gnostic Prophets*, those who bore the like character in the Christian Church, to that of Epimenides among the Heathen, (i. e.) were Priests and Diviners, to stop their mouths, which was surely to silence them, Tit. 1. 11, 12, 13. So that the *Apostles* and *Bishops* who succeeded them in Authority, had power to silence the schismatical Teachers, which is all we contend for: But neither they nor we are for silencing those Ministers that being duly ordained, are sound and orthodox, according to Mr. H's Supposition; and whether he and his Vindicator belong to the former, or the latter sort, we are willing at any time to stand a fair Trial.

As for his instance of *Apollos*, it will do him but little service, if Antiquity is to be credited, which makes this very *Apollos* the first Bishop of Corinth; and it is to be noted, that there were Teachers and Ministers before, and therefore if *Apollos* was the first Bishop, he was of another Order. And their boasted Father St. Jerome expressly tells us, that upon this very Schism of the Corinthians*, *In toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris, ad quem omnis ecclesie cura pertineret, & Schismatum semina tollerentur*. Nor that there was no Episcopal Authority before this time, it was lodged in the

* Hieron. in
Commens. ad
Titum.

the *Apostles* till now, and this was the first time they communicated it to any other person.

With the like ingenuity Mr. *H.* expounds the second place in this Epistle, where he finds the word *agapala*, telling us, First, That it could not be meant of breach of Communion, because they all came together into one place, v. 20. Secondly, That the Schisms were Quarrels and Contentions about some little things relating to the circumstances of public worship. Thirdly, That the quarrel seems to be about the time of beginning their worship, in every of which conjectures Mr. *H.* is grossly mistaken, and seems not to have understood St. Paul's meaning, as will appear if we consider,

First, That altho it is true, as I noted before, that Schismatics did not as yet hold any separate Conventicles, yet there was a most notorious breach of communion, even at the Communion-Table; and their miscarriages were so great, and of such a kind, as were scarcely reconcileable with the nature of a Sacramental Feast. Inasmuch that the Apostle tells 'em, v. 20. *When ye come together into one place, This is not to eat the Lord's Supper*, and the reason was because they did not communicate one with another. For in eating every one taketh before other his own Supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken (i. e.) The rich who contributed more plentifully to the common feast, did not suffer the poor to be sharers with them, but snatcht up their own oblation, and eat and drank it themselves. So that those who by reason of their poverty, brought little or nothing, went away hungry and ashamed, v. 21, 22. Now this was so much a breach of communion, that according to this practice there was really no communion at all. The rich lookt upon what they brought as their own Supper, to which no man else had any right, and for this reason were so hasty to eat it up themselves, that the poor had nothing. So that while one party had nothing to eat, and the rest ate every man his own without communicating one with another, there was so great a violation of the designed communion, that really they made it no communion at all.

And yet I can find no quarrels, or contentions among them. The rich who fed so plentifully had no reason to quarrel, for they had their full share even to excess. And altho the poor had really a just cause of complaint, yet perhaps because they brought nothing they thought it not seemly to mutiny. All the Apostle mentions concerning their behaviour is that they were hungry, v. 21, and as may be collected from the next verse, out of countenance and ashamed, v. 22.

'Tis pretty to see Mr. *H.* bringing in his little things here again, as tho Heresies, v. 10. to violate the pious design of a feast of Charity, v. 20. to be drunken themselves and starve the Poor, v. 21. to expose their poverty, and put them out of countenance; and all this in the Church, at their *agapae*, or feasts of charity, were to pass under the title of little things. If there had been any quarrels among 'em; these,

accord-

according to the Apostle, must have been the occasions, which surely cannot be little things in the opinion of any man, who has not himself a very large Conscience.

The reason why the *Apostle* bids them *carry one for another*, ver. 33. was, that they might have communion by eating together, and not, according to their rude and irregular practice, take every one before other his own Supper. But it is unreasonable to conclude, *That they quarrelled about the time of their meeting*: For altho' the time were fully agreed on by every mans consent, yet unless all Clocks, &c. went alike in those days, and all mens speed were equal, some would come sooner, and others later, as well as they do now; and the first might devour what they themselves brought, before such times as the rest could be there to partake with them.

I shall observe only two things more, before I pass to the next Scripture.

1. That Mr. H. in his account of this, very ingeniously passes over the next and immediate Context, ver. 21. *For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved, may be made manifest among you.* Now suppose that any man should infer hence, that the Schism mentioned, ver. 20. was occasioned by their Heresies; that their Divisions were only into *Sects* and *Parties*, some being *orthodox*; and some otherwise, as it is among us, and that hence proceeded the other irregular practices; I would fain know what he has to say to the contrary.

And 2^{dly}, It may perhaps try the wit of Mr. H. and his Brethren, to give a clear account how St. Paul's reasonings, ver. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32, can any way *quadrature*, or be reconciled to his *Nation*. And yet they must be all brought in, or else the 33^d verse quoted and urg'd by him, will bear no manner of relation to the 18th, which he designs it to interpret.

The last place Mr. H. mentions, is 1 Cor. 12. 25. *That there be no Schism in the body.* I shall pass over his Remarks, p. 14. it being sufficient for us, that he is pleas'd to acknowledge, pag. 15. that (to be Schism, which breaks or slackens the bond by which the members are knit together; which thing is so notoriously done by separation, and breach of communion, that whoever is guilty of that, may, according to Mr. H's Assertion, justly be charged with Schism. That Bond, he tells us, is not an Act of Uniformity; neither, say I, is the obligation of that Bond taken away by an Act of Indulgence. And therefore, notwithstanding the late Act, nay, tho' we should have no Act of Uniformity, yet all this would not excuse Mr. H. and his *Vindicator* from being *Schismatics*, according to his own Argument.

True Love and Charity in place of Affection; (as Mr. H. assures us) is the only Bond by which Christians are knit together — And Schism is that which breaks that Bond. That Schism does usually break Charity,

no man will deny, Mr. H. and his Party are sufficient instances of this truth, as those persons who have the zeal and courage to oppose their *Faction*, do always find when ever they fall into their hands.

And that *Love* and *Charity* is likewise a means to prevent *Schisms*, as it always pays a just deference to all *spiritual Governors*, cools and abates the violence of *Faction*, makes People *humble, obedient, and docile*, and causes all to endeavor after *peace* and *unity*, we do readily acknowledge; and for this reason both the *Apostles* and others have all along in their discourses about *Schism*, pressed men to *Charity*, as a necessary means to bring them over to *conformity* and *unity* with a *sound and orthodox Church*. But to infer hence, That *Charity* in point of *Affection*, is the only Bond by which *Christians* are knit together, and that *Schism* consequently is nothing else but *Uncharitableness*, are Positions only fit for Mr. H. to assert, and the *Vindicator* to justify.

St. Paul does not say, as Mr. H. falsely quotes him, *That it is the unity of the Spirit that is the bond of peace*, Eph. 4.3. but exhorts the *Ephesians* to keep the *unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace*: so that the *bond of peace* must needs be something more than barely the *unity of the Spirit*. And by the *unity of the Spirit*, more is certainly to be understood than only *Charity*, as appears by the References made to it in the Context, ver. 4. 7. & 11, &c. which thorowly considered, makes this Text little or nothing to Mr. H's purpose.

And withal it is to be remembred, that the *Apostle* insists upon several other ties and obligations whereby *Christians* are knit together, besides *Charity*, viz. they are incorporated into *one society, one body*, as well as animated by *one spirit*, ver. 4. united in *one hope* of their blessed calling, *ibid.* united as *Subjects to the same Lord*, as *Professors of one and the same Faith*, initiated into the *same Mysteries*; and *Partners in the same Covenant*, by *one and the same Baptism*; and united by our union and communion with the *orthodox Governors and Pastors of the Church*, which, St. Paul tells us, were given us for the perfecting of the *Saints*; or, according to the Original, *ἡμεῖς καὶ ὑμεῖς ὅσοι ἐσμὲν ὁ ἅγιος*, for the compacting or knitting together of the *Saints*, ver. 12. *ὡς ἐκδοξάμεν ὡς ἐκκλησίαν ὡς ἁγίαν*, for the edifying or building up of the *body of Christ*, till we all come in the *unity of the faith*, &c. unto a *perfect man*, &c. that we henceforth be no more *Children* tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of *Doctrine* by the *sight of men*, and *cunning craftiness*, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, ver. 13, 14. From all which it appears, that Mr. H. is for *one Doctrine*, and St. Paul for another; and therefore having laid both opinions before the Reader, I freely leave it to his own choice whether of the two he will follow.

Charity is certainly the *bond of perfectness*; but what is meant by *ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἁγίος*, Col. 3. 14. Mr. H. has not informed us: which surely he ought to have done, before he had made any inference from these words, whether *ἁγίος* signifies *mercifulness*, as it Hammond does, Luke 6. 36. or *perfectness*, in all the duties of *Christianity*. Cha. in loc.

ity may either way be the *outside*, or bond of it; for *Charity* is a very large and comprehensive virtue: The *Apostle* tells us, *it is the fulfilling of the Law*. So that every duty you can name is included in it, and every sin a violation of it: The *Thief* breaks *Charity*, when he picks his Neighbour's *Pocket*: The *Murderer*, when he cuts his *Throat*: The *Traitor*, when he conspires against his *Prince*: And the *Schismatic*, who makes *Broils* and *Factions* in the *Church*. But still, if any one should ask you—*Pray, Sir, What is Treason?* and you should answer, *Uncharitableness?* What is Murder? *Uncharitableness*. What is Theft? *Uncharitableness*. What is Schism? *Uncharitableness*. I believe no man would take you for a Conjuror in *Logic*, any more than in *Divinity*.

And yet this is all that Mr. *M. H.* has done towards furnishing the world with a *New Notion* of *Schism*, and to acquire to himself the glorious Titles of *Modest* and *Ingenious*, which the *Vindicator* so liberally bestows upon him, *pag. 3.* which how well he deserves, let the *Reader* judge, and upon these doughty premisses he founds his Description of *Schism*, which ought, I suppose, to have been a definition, that being much more proper for a Man of *Art*, and much more suitable to his design, of giving you the true nature, or *formalis ratio*: which are things a little too nice to be regularly inferred from every bungling Description. And having thus far enquired into Mr. *H.*'s Account, let us now return to the *Vindicator*: I fancy they are both of a Family, and therefore let us see whether he may not put in a better claim to the aforesaid Titles.

He acquits Mr. *H.* *pag. 4.* from being *Author of the Reply*, fearing lest he should have a share in the credit of it, of which there was no great danger; for every body at first sight was willing to discharge Mr. *H.* it being not easy to imagine, that he that could be the Author of such a Book as that of *Schism*, should ever be able to make any tolerable Vindication. *Alderman Wilcock of Chester.*

In the next page he condemns *T. W.* for preferring *Churchmen* before *Dissenters*, (i.e.) his *Friends* before his *Enemies*. To this I shall only answer, That it is natural to all Mankind, and his own usual practice, and therefore I may as well blame the *Vindicator* upon the same score, especially for so partially preferring Mr. *H.* before Dr. *Hammond*, *p. 49.*

He boasts, *pag. 6.* how early he and his Party were aware of the *Advances of Popish designs*. I would fain know where their Eyes were during the whole Reign of King *James II.* and the Toleration of King *Charles*, when, according to the sense of all wise Men, the *Popish Agents* were most industrious.

In all the glare of Gospel-light these *Gentlemen* could see no danger, but rather did all they could to shelter and hide the design from other observing Protestants. Dr. *W.*—*had 100 l. for writing a Book to that purpose. *Lobb* and *Owen* were in Fee with King *James*. Several of the principal Nonconformists assisted in the management of

the Jesuitical Intrigue. Many of their present Payons were the Men pitcht upon at Court, to compleat our Ruine, by repealing the Penal Laws and Tests, and thereby letting Papists into the Parliament, and their Priests into our Churches. No Man among them opened his mouth against the common Foe, or endeavoured to fortify his Conscience against Popish delusions. And in the whole Catalogue * of Authors that appeared during that Reign, in the defence of our Religion, there were but Two Nonconformists in all England, who had the Honesty and Courage to set Pen to Paper in those Controversies.

* Vid. Catalogue of all the Discourses published against Popery, during the Reign of K. James II. p. 33. printed at Lond. A. D. 1689.

So that altho' these Gentlemen can be aware of Popery as soon as any People living, (perhaps, when the greatest danger is what themselves invent) yet, as the wise man observes, *A Gift blindeth the Eyes*: Sprinkle a little Money among their Leaders, and give a Toleration to the rest, that the Subjects may be paying in the Countrey, while the King pays them at London, they are all easy, and well satisfied, while they are all getting money; so that do what you will, they apprehend no danger. I appeal to the Memory of all England, whether this be not the Case: I appeal to your own Consciences, wishing that you may repent, and beg pardon.

For I must tell you further, (and perhaps it will be a kindness to let you know it) that how ever successful you may seem to your selves, in preserving your Reputation among the less discerning Mob; yet the more sober and thinking People are very much scandaliz'd at these Practices, and sometimes do not stick to say, *That your zeal against Popery is all counterfeit; your design only to get uppermost; and that you can either rail against the Papists, or join with them, whether way soever does best fit your purpose of ruining the Church*. Nay, some uncharitable People go further, and say, *That since you join'd with Popery against the Church, more than ever you did with the Church against Popery, they are afraid lest if that Religion should prevail, (which God forbid) you would be a great deal better Conformists than you are now*.

He is again angry with T. W. for mentioning those great Men who have written in defence of the Church, pag. 6. and endeavours to oppose him with another Catalogue of baffled Names, Reynolds, Cartwright, Blondel, Amies, Daille, &c. People that have been so fully answer'd and confuted by Mr. Hooker, Dr. Hammond, Bishop Pearson, Mr. Dodwell, and others, that if the power of Reason could ever prevail against Interest and Prejudice, a Man would think there needed no further Arguings with these Gentlemen, whether this be so or not, we are willing to refer with him to the judgment of all disinterested persons, if the Vindicator will but tell us where we may have a Council of those who are truly such: For to me, the whole Christian world seems to be concerned in these Controversies. Those who have a Liturgy, and Ceremonies, or Bishops, as well as we; and those that would have all these, if their circumstances were so happy, are certainly

for us. And as for that smaller Party who are for none of these, and are most of them confined within our King's Dominions, they are all biassed and interested against us; so that in rejecting the Judgment of every interested Party, methinks the Gentleman learnedly appeals to no body at all.

Only perhaps the *Turks, Jews, and Heathens*, in his Opinion, may be proper Judges, who, I confess, are not much interest'd in the quarrels among *Christians*. And yet taking in all Mankind, (which must surely comprehend those that lived in former Ages, as well as the present, and I am sure they do not appear to be the Patrons or Friends of his *Schism*) the *Jews* must condemn him upon the same Principles as they did the *Samaritans*; the *Turks* and *Persians* laid too much stress upon the business of Succession; and the most rever'd Laws of the noblest body of *Heathens* that ever liv'd in the world, were expressly against him: *Separatim nemo habessit Deos, neque novos neve advenas nisi publice ad electos, privatim colunto, constructa à Patribus delubra habento, Ritus Familia Patriaque servanto.* So that I know no Patron, either *Christian* or *Heathen*, the Gentleman has to appeal to, unless it be his own scattered Party, or some of his Friends, the *New Whigg Atheists*. And as for their Judgment and Approbation, much good may it do him, I know no Man of ours that envies his happiness.

Leg. 12. Tab.

There is a wonderful vein of *Argument* (not to say *Discretion*) in his management of *T. W.'s Honours*, pag. 7. If he supposes any weakness in himself, he does not pretend to be infallible. Suppose he makes but a slip in style, (which he hopes a Friend will pardon) the performance must necessarily be *all vicious*. But, on the contrary, if he allows a *Dissenter* the least grain of *Christian temper, humility, or consideration*, so as not to be totally divested of all three, it is enough to saint him, he needs trouble himself no further, for *his condition is very hopeful, and cannot be desperate*, pag. 8.

But, above all, the *Address* to the *Sceptics* does most afflict him, especially that *T. W.* should suppose *any Sceptic to be obstinate*, pag. 9. Now, for my part, I cannot perceive that ever he supposed any such thing, his words are these: *If thou be Sceptical, a sligher of our Religion, obstinate and perverse, a despiser and reviler of the Clergy.* By which it is plain, *T. W.* intended four several Characters of those who are Enemies to the Church, now there is no necessity that they should all be united in the same persons; but if they are all found among the members of the same Faction, (as certainly they are) it is abundantly sufficient to acquit the *Alderman*. However, the witty *Vindicator*, by changing *Sceptical* into *Sceptic*, and putting *obstinate* to it, takes care to make *Nonsense*, where otherwise it is not to be found. This being a part of the Ingenuity of these *Gentlemen*, to make *Faults* where they cannot find them; and to raise *Blunders* out of their own imagination, and then confute them; which surely is the worst, tho' one of the easiest ways of arguing that a man can chuse. He

He is mightily offended with the *Alderman*, for making the *Ninth Article of the Apostles Creed the Standard* whereby to discover *Schism*, as if it were a most heinous Crime, no less than declining the Authority of Scripture, to make use of it. The profession of that *Creed* has been the badge and symbol of all orthodox Christians, for many past Centuries : which certainly it would not have been, if they had not all believed it to be agreeable to the Scripture. And unless these *Gentlemen* have a mind to extinguish all the former sentiments of the *Christian Church*, that they may the better impose upon the World what ever *Notions* they please, I know no reason why it should now be laid aside. 'Tis plain *T. W.* never intended to rival the Scripture with this Article; for he goes on immediately to explain it by the sacred Text, tho' in this Case he cannot be so happy as to please our peevish Author.

He quarrels with him likewise about the *Origination of the Catholic Church*, and is angry that he does not date it from the Creation of *Angels*, or from the Beginning of the *Jewish Church*: As if the *Gentleman* had never heard of the distinctions betwixt the *Church Visible*, and *Mystical*; *Jewish*, and *Christian*; or some body or other had put it into his head, that the *Angels* are *Christians*, it being the *Catholic Church* under that denomination only that *T. W.* spoke of.

When our *Saviour* uttered those words, *Mat. 16. 18. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church*; I desire to know of the *Vindicator*, whether he did not speak of the Church *de futuro*, and as yet unbuilt: And when *St. Luke* says, *And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved*; whether he did not speak of it as already begun? so that the *Christian Church* must have its beginning betwixt the time of that first saying to *St. Peter*, and that other in *St. Luke*. If the *Gentleman* will try his *Chronology*, and assign us the year and day, we shall gladly hear him; but if he will still derive its *Epocha* from the Creation of *Angels*, we are ready to assert the contrary. In the mean time he ought to be a little sparing in his *Reflections* upon *T. W.* for if he were a *Dunce*, and a *Blockhead*, or a ridiculous *Trifler* for this account of the *Origination of the Catholic Christian Church*, both ** Tertullian* and *St. Jerome*† (not to say our *Saviour**) and *St. Luke*, must equally be comprehended in the same charge. Nay, the *Vindicator* himself grants in the next Paragraph, that the *Apostles* and *Disciples* were the *Church*, without either *Jews* or *Angels*: And therefore if *T. W.* were a *Fool* for passing them by, I hope the *Gentleman* will not disdain to bear him company.

esse possunt. Qui necdum Spiritum possint agnoscere descendit missum, sed nec ecclesiam defendere qui quando & quibus incensibilis institutum est hoc corpus probare non debent. Tertull. de Præ. cap. 21. † Illa Apostolorum nudum quidem sonare videntur Historiam ex nascen- Ecclesie infantium

* Probatibus
actis Apostolorum
descensum
Spiritus Sancti
quam Scriptu-
ram qui non
recipiunt nec
Spiritus Sancti

He is mightily troubled, pag. 11. about the admission of *Church-Members*, that it cannot be done barely upon their profession of Faith, without complying with some significant Rites that are alien to Scripture-Rules. If he had but told us plainly what he had meant, I could have given a more direct Answer, in the mean time let him know that we decline the Charge.

The Disciples and Believers submitted to the authority of the Apostles, in things indifferent. And if our English Dissenters would be as just to their Successors, according to the rules and examples recorded in Scripture, no body would require more from 'em. As for the saying of the Bishop of Worcester, (which I suppose he durst not quote, because he was conscious to himself that it was nothing to his purpose) it concerns the Papists only, and for what belongs to us, I refer him to many other excellent sayings of the aforesaid Bishop, in his *Unreasonableness of Separation*.

In the next paragraph he complains that Christianity does not make a greater progress in the world, and immediately charges the failure upon needless ceremonies, and want of worth in the managers. Now whether this be so or not he may easily try, if he will either send Mr. H. or go himself, (for I do not question but he will allow both to be exceedingly well qualified) and give a call to the unconverted. Let 'em try the Emperor of China or the Cham of Tartary, or (as T. W. advis'd them) the grand Signior if he pleases; if the sanctity of the Preachers, the Spirituality and simplicity of Doctrine and Worship after the Congregational way; If zeal against Ceremonies without adoring any sort of Religion will do the business. We shall soon see whether the Independent, or the Jesuit, are more successful (for there lies the controversie) the Divines of the Church of England are no way concern'd, having not been much accustomed to travel upon that errand.

It seems he never heard that the Apostles did actually preach the Gospel to all nations, neither do I believe they did to all Countries, and to every person in every Nation. But if he will give us leave to expound it of some persons out of all Nations, (which I suppose was all that T. W. meant, and the thing is true, for) St. Peter we read preach'd Acts 2. and his Congregation consisted of people in all probability out of every nation under heaven, Acts 2. 5.

That the primitive Bishops had the power of ordination and government, (whereby their authority did exceed that of meet Presbyters) and that the Churches of several Presbyters were united under the government and care of one Bishop, has been sufficiently evinc'd by divers learned Pens: particularly that of Ephesus, (one of the famous Seven in Asia) has been again and again prov'd to be so govern'd. And this is all that we need to contend

rend for, but if nothing less will satisfy him than having every Diocese acted, that he may know exactly *the extent*, (which he so briskly calls for, p. 13.) let him be at the charge of it himself, we for our parts are well contented with less ado, unless it were to more purpose. The primitive Dioceses being never suppos'd to be all equal, but some greater and some less, as well as the modern.

Neither is it necessary to shew that their modes of worship were exactly the same with ours: the Vindicator himself assures us that they did not agree among themselves about the circumstances of worship; and then how can he expect that they should all agree with us. That they us'd and impos'd things of the same nature with what he calls our modes, and that our Governors are warranted in doing the like by their example and Authority, is all we need to shew; and that has been done often enough already by divers hands.

We confess that *Bishop and Angel are not convertible terms*, and yet suppose St. John had said Angels of each Church in the plural number (instead of Angel in the Singular); I would know how any man could prove Episcopacy from those texts. And surely where an Argument may be made from the number in which a word is us'd, he is not far amiss that should say such a thing is plain from that word.

He triumphs in the next paragraph, 14. 15. as if he had found the Independent notion in one of T. W.'s assertions, Nay he cannot see how there should be a multiplication or plurality of Churches till the increase of believers, according to the Episcopal model. If the Gentleman will be pleased to put on his spectacles, I will endeavour to shew him how. Suppose then that one parcel of converts were made at Jerusalem, another at Corinth, another at Ephesus, another at Antioch, and another at Rome, and a Bishop and Presbyters constituted over each particular Church. I desire him to consider, whether this will not be the thing which T. W. spoke of, *viz. A multiplication or plurality of Churches by the increase of believers*, without any necessity of supposing that Churches must multiply like Bees, only by sending out a Colony when the Hive is too full.

And suppose a Colony were sent out under the conduct of a Presbyter, and he still under the government of the same, or another Bishop, I suppose this would do the business, without any great service to the Congregational way.

But why did not the Vindicator give us some Scripture instances of this famous notion? For, if a Colony must needs be sent out under independent Officers, when ever believers grow too numerous for one Assembly, it may surely be proved that some time or other it was so. And therefore

I must call upon Mr. Vindicator for matter of fact, which unless he can produce (and I am pretty sure he cannot) he must not expect that much credit should be given to him: It being a little too much for him to impose his notions upon us, as if they were all according to Scripture; and yet not one Text to be found for them.

I would fain know how many Congregations there were in the Church of *Jerusalem*, when the believers increased to so vast a number in so short a time: Three thousand you meet with converted, *Acts* 2. 41. More daily added, *v.* 47. Five thousand you find mentioned, *Acts* 4. 4. Multitudes both of men and women added, *c.* 5. 14. And yet still the word of God increased, and the number of the Disciples multiplied in *Jerusalem* greatly, and a great company of the Priests were obedient to the faith, *c.* 6. 7. Now I desire him to give me his Answer to these following Queries: Whether all this number of Believers did make one Congregation or more? Whether or no they were under the Government of only one Bishop? Whether each of them was known to his Bishop, and to one another? Whether they could not be Members of the same Church, till they were all personally acquainted? Did they all ordinarily meet in one place to worship God? And if so, where was it? Were the *synagoga* so capacious? Or did the Jews lend the Temple for an ordinary Meeting-place to the Christians? How the Preacher could be heard by all this Multitude at once? Whether the vigor and strength of his Lungs, or the thinness of *Jerusalem* air, did enable and qualifie him for that loud Performance? Or whether he had the Conqueror's Engine, or Sir *Samuel Morland's* Speaking Trumpet? Or a peculiar sort of voice (like Mr. *Baxters* Friend, who preach'd to a Congregation of ten thousand men, so that they could all hear him, and yet his voice was none of the loudest) I desire his information in these particulars, that we may see whether it be likely that the Church of *Jerusalem* did increase and multiply in the Congregational way: but we hope he will not stir a syllable from the sacred Text, that being no way proper for a man that receives nothing but express Scripture.

In the next Paragraph he falls foul upon one of his own blunders. And because *T.W.* affirms that all other Churches were one with that of *Jerusalem*, all united in one body, under one head Christ Jesus, thinks he confounds him mightily by proving a variety in circumstances of worship (as if to say) that those Churches were united in one body, and that all Members agreed in every circumstance of worship, were the same thing, and he that confutes the latter, confutes the former also.

He might have consider'd, that even in that variety, many other *Apostolical Churches* were the same. The *Churches of Rome and Corinth*, and most others, were made out of *Jews and Gentiles*, who had the same different apprehensions about *Jewish Ceremonies*, as well as that at *Jerusalem*; And therefore the difference was not betwixt *Church and Church*, but betwixt the *Members of the same Churches*, who were left at liberty by the *Apostolical Synod*, except in three things; And for that Reason the *Gentile Dissenters* cannot possibly be the *Patrons of ours*, unless the *Vindicator* can shew, that the *Jewish Ceremonies* were impos'd, as ours are, by some *Christian Church*. If he can prove, that *Rules* were given, and *Matters of Decence* impos'd, and that any *Christians* in that *Age* refus'd to submit to 'em, let him name 'em, as the *Precedents of his Cause and Party*, I dare say, That every *Churchman* will allow 'em to be so.

In the next Paragraph he is fond of the Notion which he quarrell'd with in the last (so inconstant are those people that know not what they would have). It fits the *Independents* as exactly as it it had been made for 'em; for they hold a *Unity for Substance* (tho not for *Circumstances*); they are united to all true Churches, tho for condemning *Bishops* (who are doubtless the principal and most necessary Members); they partake of the same *Table*, tho they set up *Altar* against *Altar*; they are the same with us in the *External Worship and Service of God*, tho in *Covenant* against us; and they refuse to communicate with us either in *Sacraments or Prayers*. They are all united to the *Head*, tho not into one *Body*, either among themselves or with others: For that part of *Unity* I observe the *Gent* passes over and with a great deal of Reason, it being hard to find several Members united into One *Body*, and yet still remaining all independent. That wherein they differ from others is according to the *Apostolical Mode*; That wherein others differ from them, is nothing but *Innovation*; Otherwise they are the same with all true Churches, if you will believe this *Gent*. To all which I shall only apply, and argue in the plain words of *St. John*; They went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us, *1 John 2. 19.* ἵνα φανερωθῇ ὅτι οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν.

Touching the Continuance of the Church he agrees with us, p. 17. Only about the Authority of the Apostles he is pleas'd to fall out, not apprehending how any Man can succeed the Apostles in their *Apostolical Power*. If he means the Authority they had in the Church (i. e.) over the *Presbyters*, and other Members, we affirm *Bishops* to be their Successors; it being not reasonable to suppose, that any Branch of Authority given by our Saviour to his Apostles died with them, for if their Authority over the *Presbyters* expir'd with their Persons, why should that over the People continue after 'em, unless the Gentleman will

will suppose (which I suppose he will not) that the *Laity* are the only persons that need the *Regulation of Superiours*. All Multitudes must have Governours, and the common *Presbyters* are certainly too Numerous a Populace to be all independent. Let 'em submit therefore to *Bishops* their Successors, as they did to the *Apostles themselves*, especially till such times as you can find a Text to prove, That the *Apostles* Commission was only a *Patent for Life*; it being a Matter of such Consequence in the *Universal Church*, that few will believe you upon your own bare Word.

As the *Authority of the Apostles was Universal*, and extended to the whole World, and was the same in all Churches, p. 18. so *Bishops* do succeed them in the same *Authority*. And if it were not for those *Humane Agreements* (which the *Vindicator* cannot disallow), the Government Ecclesiastical must be so exercised; And I could wish the Gentleman would be pleas'd to consider, whether a *Bishop* is not as truly a *Bishop*, and a *Presbyter* as much a *Presbyter*, in any other Man's Diocess or Parish, as he is in his own? Is he suspended or deprived when he's out of his own bounds? If not, I hope he may be a Minister, like the *Apostles*, all the World over. And yet the exercise of his Ministry confin'd within certain limits. Nor do's this Notion give the *Pope* any greater power in England, than it do's the *Archbishop of Canterbury* at Rome (which is none at all.) On the contrary, if Ordinary Pastors are Pastors only within their own Precincts, Mr. H. and his *Vindicator* (tho Ordain'd) can be none, because they exercise their pretended Ministry in other Mens Parishes.

He will not dispute the Episcopal Jurisdiction of *Timothy* and *Titus*, but he tells us, it signifies nothing till the nature and extent of that Office be first determin'd out of Scripture, p. 18. As if the *Epistles to Timothy* and *Titus* were no Scripture. We find *Timothy* appointed by St. Paul to examine the Qualifications of such as were to be Ordain'd; to lay hands suddenly on no Man; to receive Accusations, and proceed judicially; and to rebuke before all even Elders themselves, if there were occasion. *Titus* was to ordain Elders in every City, to set things in order, to rebuke with all authority, to admonish and reject heretics. And this power of Ordination and Jurisdiction wherewith *Timothy* and *Titus* were invested, is what the Bishops have all along exercised, and do still challenge at this day; and therefore we justify the present Episcopal Authority by these two Scripture-Instances. And as the *Congregational Invention* allows of no such Officers, the most Ordinary Pastors (call 'em *Bishops*, or *Presbyters*, or what you will) being all independent, without ever a *Timothy* or *Titus* to supervise and govern 'em; by the same Scripture it stands condemn'd, and is plainly contrary to the Apostolical Pattern.

And if the Office of *Timothy* and *Titus* was itinerant, by reason of their

their frequent Removes from place to place (as the Gent. supposes, p. 19.) our Bishops are extremely like 'em in that particular, their Office being always very itinerant in their *Episcopal Visitations*. But this is an idle Fancy, which he probably learn'd from Mr. Baxter (an idle one I call it); for if the Office of *Timothy* and *Titus* was really itinerant, they were certainly out of their Office while they staid at home, the one in *Ephesus*, and the other in *Crete* (tho doing that very business for which the *Apostles* plac'd 'em there) which how well it agrees with Scripture and common Sense, let every discerning Reader judge.

If none besides St. Paul were concern'd in the Ordination of *Timothy* and *Titus*, it surely justifies the present Ordinations by a single Bishop; but if others join'd with him in Imposition of Hands, as the Gent. supposes in the following p. *T. W.* was not much out; several of the Primitive Bishops being Styl'd *Apostles* by the Ancients, as well as the Twelve: And therefore before he had condemn'd *T. W.* he ought to have told us who those were that laid on hands with St. Paul, and to demonstrate 'em Unworthy of that Title. But it is sufficient to justify *T. W.* that what is done only by one, has been commonly said to be done by the *Apostles*, by reason of their being Colleagues, and Partners in the same Apostleship.

I dare answer for *T. W.* That this Man's Notion of a proper Succession never enter'd into his head; No Man besides *Blondel*, and his quarrelsome Brethren, ever reckoning it improper to call Two persons the Successors of One, when really they are so. When Two Persons are Heirs to One, in the same Estate, or succeed him in his Authority, they are call'd by *Civilians* (and I believe not improperly) *Heredes*, or *Successores partiarum*. When the Roman Empire became divided, I would fain know, whether *Constantine the Great*, and *Jovian*, &c. had no Successors? And I hope the Gent. will allow Their Majesties, *K. W.* and *Q. M.* to be call'd the Successors of *K. J.* without any great Absurdity. And as there are Instances enough to be given of Two Persons succeeding One in his Secular Estate and Authority, so I know no Reason, why Two Bishops may not as well succeed One Apostle in the Ecclesiastical. The larger the *Apostles Province* was, the more Divisions it was capable of, and consequently the more Successors he might have; *Timothy* might succeed him at *Ephesus*, *Titus* in *Crete*, &c. Nor does this succeeding of the Apostle in these Two Provinces, give 'em an equal Power in one another's Diocesses (as the *Indicator* supposes, p. 19.) any more than the King of Spain has Power at *Rome* or *Constantinople*, because the Roman Emperors are number'd amongst his Predecessors, by *Franciscus Taraph*, and other Spanish Historians.

urbana villa Nicomedia tricesimo ex primo Imperii sui anno diem suum est. libris. de successione Romanorum
Ordo regum et Imperatorum scriptis. Ruffin. H. E. l. 6. c. 11.

Sed quod ab uno Apostolo gestum est id ab omnibus simul Apostolis gestum esse dicitur ob Collegium & Consortium Apostolorum Vales. Annot. in Philo. 1. 1. c. 13. c. 15.

Sub imperatore Claudio loco duorum unicus Praefectus Praetoris Constitutus est Burrhus Africanus. Sub Nerone Burrho mortuo duo praefecti praetoris constituti sunt ut unus successor. Vales. de success. Diss. 1. c. 1. X. ubi plura in hujus argumenti fidem, allata legatur.

ΤΕΛΕΥΤΙ-
ΟΝΟΣ ΔΕ Α.
ΛΕΞΕΝΤΕΣ Η
ΜΕΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ
ΔΙΕΚΛΕΙΝΕΝ
ΜΕΙΩΣΤΕ ΤΟ
Ι. Ι. Γ. Μ.
ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΟΝ
ΣΤΑΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΙ
ΑΝΤΙΣΤΑΝΤΕΣ

(Nor is there any necessity to suppose (as the Gent. would insinuate), that the Apostle must either be suspended, or degraded, or translated to an higher Seat, to make room for the Succession of Timothy and Titus in the Sees of Ephesus and Crete: For it is evident, the Apostle himself gave them a Plenitude of Power within their respective Charges (chuse how much or how little he reserv'd to himself,) So that they had the full Ordering and Government of those Two Churches, and did therefore succeed the Apostle in it, even while he was alive.

But if the Vindicator will needs call 'em the Apostle's Coadjutors, while he was alive, and give 'em the Title of Successors only, after his Decease, I know T. W. will not quarrel with him; it being no way contrary to any thing he hath said. In the mean time I must desire him to forbear making wry Faces. If any one shall still assert, That St. Paul Ordain'd his Successors at Ephesus and Crete; for as it is impossible, that the Apostle should have any Successors, unless ordain'd by themselves; nor very probable that they ordain'd 'em when they were dead: So according to the Opinion of the Ancients, and common Sense, they are said by T. W. to ordain 'em while they were alive. Thus Irenæus, Ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi—

Idem. lib. 3. c. 3.

quos & Successores relinquebant suum ipsorum locum Magistris tradentes. And a little after, speaking concerning the Bishops of the Church of Rome, Fundantes igitur & instrumentes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam Linus Episcopatum administranda Ecclesie tradiderunt. From which Two Passages it is plain, That the Apostles ordain'd Bishops their Successors while they were alive, and that Linus, a single Person, succeeded the Apostles in the plural; which is the double blunder, in express terms, wherewith our nimble-sighted Author charges T. W. p. 20. Nor will Tertullian easily free himself from our Author's Censure, if he ever hears of that Passage de Prescript. c. 32. Evolvant Ordinem Episcoporum suorum ita per Successiones ad initia decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverint habuerint Autorem & Antecessorem. Hoc enim modo Ecclesie Apostolica census suos deserunt, sicut Smyræorum Ecclesia Polycarpum à Joanne Collocatum; sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum itidem perinde utiq; & cæteræ exhibent quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum Constitutos Apostolici Seminis traduces habeant. So that according to Tertullian, the Apostles ordain'd the first Bishops in each Church, and were their Predecessors, and they the Apostles Successors.

Nor was it ever thought so great a Mystery, by Men of Sense, either in Ancient or Later Ages, for a Bishop, or other Person, to ordain or constitute his Successor, as this Man makes it. The Council of Antioch decrees it Unlawful for a Bishop to constitute his Successor. But if (according to the Opinion of our Author) they had thought it a thing impossible, they would certainly have spar'd

spared their Pains; it being not very usual for Wise Men to make Laws against Impossibilities.

Valerius ordained St. Augustine his Successor, and he Heraclius; Augustine of Canterbury, ordained Laurentinus to succeed him in that See, according to Bede, who (says he) did it after the Example of St. Peter, who is said to have consecrated Clement, evangelizandi adjutores & simul Successorem. And Epiphanius gives the Reason, why other Persons were made Bishops in the Life-time of St. Peter and St. Paul, even because the Apostles did frequently travel into other Countries to preach the Gospel, and the City of Rome could not be without a Bishop: To which I might add, That Severus, Bishop of Miletus, and Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz, did, after the Example of the Apostles, ordain Persons to succeed 'em in those Sees. And now surely nothing but that Faculty of Ignorance (if there be such a Faculty) wherewith he reproaches T. W. p. 21. could have embolden'd this Indicator to charge a Man with Nonsense and Blunder, for asserting plain Matter of Fact, when there are so many Instances to be found of the same Nature, according to the Sense and Practice of several Ages.

I fancy few, besides this confident Author, will deny Linus to be the Successor of the Apostles; and yet that he died before 'em, is maintain'd by Bishop * Pearson, who, tho he was as Learned as Crotius, yet he is as positive as T. W. that Linus immediately succeeded the Apostles in the Roman Chair. And therefore I cannot but wonder, that our Author should pretend, That all the Learned Men in the World deliver 'emselfs timorously and uncertainly about this matter. It is a Caution that Keeb; the Jesuit, gives all young Students, to be ware how they assert a thing to be the Opinion of All Authors. For, says he, if any one happen to be of a contrary mind, you are quite sham'd. Now here's some Modesty in a Jesuit, but such is the Confidence of this Nonconformist, that he pretends to tell you the Sense of all the Learned Men in the World (tho he never heard of their Names), as readily as if he himself had been one of 'em, or at least, they had been his Familiars, and most intimate Acquaintances.

With the same Gaiety, he affirms in the same page, That in the Line of Apostolick Succession of Bishops, hath continued in all Ages to this present time, is an Assertion without the least shadow of Proof; yea, contrary to the Acknowledgment of all Church-Historians, p. 211. Pray, Sir, what Church-Historians ever acknowledg'd the contrary? A Man would imagine, that he meant only those of his Party, who have been a Scandal to their Undertaking; or else, if otherwise, it could be done, he needed not to have been ashamed to have given us their Names; but I am afraid, he is no better acquainted with Church-Historians, than with other Learned Men.

Only as to the Papists (so lately his Croquet), we may, I suppose, take his word, that they own insuperable Difficulties about the Succession of

Bede Ec.
Hist. l. 2. c. 40.
ΠΑΝΘΛΛΟ
καὶ ὅτως ἐ-
δύνατο ἐν
σερίοντων
Φημι δὲ τῶν
περὶ Πέτρον
καὶ πύλον
ἐπισκόπου
ἄλλος καὶ δι-
σώζει θεῶν
τὸ τὸς Ἀπο-
στόλους πολ-
λάκις ἐπὶ
τὰς ἄλλας
παρίδας τὴν
πορείαν σὺν
λεῶσαι διὰ τὸ
κήρυγμα τῶ
Χριστοῦ μὴ δύ-
νασθαι δὲ
τὴν Ρωμαιο-
νὰ πόλιν ἀ-
νευεσινοῦ
ἐνείναι.
Epiph. Her.

* Pear. de suc-
cess. Dist. 2. c. 2.
Vid. etiam Ven-
delin. de Clemen-
tis Temp.

Nihil clarius
in tota veterum
Doctrina succe-
ssum Romanum
Pontificum
Phil. le Pr. in
not. ad Tert. de
Popes p. 6. 32.

Popes in the Roman See, p. 22. But what is this to the purpose? they neither deny, nor doubt, that there was a Succession (altho' for want of Writings, they cannot determine the Order wherein those Bishops succeeded). There are Difficulties concerning the Succession of Monarchs in several Kingdoms, not easily solv'd for want of Authors: And yet to say, All Catalogues are false, because we cannot tell certainly which is true, or because (through distance of time, and want of Authors) we cannot tell who first succeeded: To conclude that there was no Succession at all, is a way of arguing peculiar to its Author.

If *Irenaeus* could Name all the Successors in the Apostolick Churches, as the Gent. grants in the fore-cited page, I presume he could not be mistaken in the Succession of *Linus*. And if this *Vindicator* had been but so learn'd, as to be acquainted with that Father, he would not have been so Angry with *T. W.* p. 21. for Asserting the same thing that *Irenaeus* does. I shall not trouble my self with his Mistake about the Year of that Father's Death; for tho' he disputed about the business of *Easter* Seven Years after that, in which (as some body told this Gent.) he died; yet it is no great matter, since he says will serve a *Nonconformist* instead of Chronology.

With the same Skill he proceeds to enquire, how it came to pass that the Apostolical Succession was propagated in so few Churches as the Patriarchal were? As if it were the Opinion of any body, that no Bishop, besides the Patriarchs, did any where succeed the Apostles. If he ever met with such an Assertion, let him tell us whole it is: In the mean time, if (for want of Argument, and Understanding in these Controversies) he quarrels with his own *Chimera's*, I hope it is not to be call'd a Confutation of *T. W.*

We have a Catalogue of our *English Bishops*; so that we can name 'em as they succeeded, so far as we have *History* to inform us, which is for many Centuries. And as we find the Succession Regular, where we have a clear Account; so we have no Reason to doubt of the like Care in former Ages; which is satisfaction enough to us, that our present Ministry is regularly deriv'd from the Apostles. And he that shall Assert the contrary, so as to make us doubt of it, must bring proof from good Authors, That the Succession was interrupted, or else he will be but a feeble Exposer of our Principles. It is not sufficient to say, we are uncertain whether we have any true Ministry or Ordinances, p. 23. we rely upon the Providence of God, and the Care and Integrity of our Ancestors, for a Right Succession of Ministers, as well as pure and genuine Scriptures, And altho' we have not the Original Manuscripts to compare the one, nor intire *Fasts* in the other case; yet no Man shall bereave us of our Confidence, unless he can produce Matter of Fact, and Show, that we are deriv'd upon either Account. I fancy the *Vindicator*

dicator does verily believe, that he came regularly from Adam; and yet suppose any one should object, that he cannot tell his own Pedigree, and give a Series of his Ancestors down from Adam to himself, and conclude, that the Succession might therefore be broken, some one of his Progenitors might have ne're a Father, and since he has not History to inform him perfectly in the Case, he ought not positively to affirm, That he is of the Seed of Adam. Would the Gent. take this way of Arguing to be strong and conclusive? if not, I would fain know what occasion we have given him to impose it upon us.

But that he may not seem to talk wildly, and without any manner of Ground, he puts Two Cases, which I presume were all he could think of, wherein the Line of Succession might be broken; p. 24. The first is, *If there should happen a Vacancy in any of the Apostolical Churches, and Sees, for some Years, and the succeeding Incumbent be a Person ordain'd by an Abbot, who is no Bishop (as the Northumbrian Bishops were by the Abbot of Hy, says the Margine), as is allowed in the Roman Church, through which this Authority must be convey'd to us; Does not this make an Intercision in the Line of Episcopal Ordination so indispensible?* It must do so, if you will believe this Author, p. 25. But I say, there is no Necessity of the Line being broken, tho we grant the whole Case; For suppose, that all that Succession of pretended Bishops deriv'd from the Abbot, should be at last extind, and the true Bishops of that, or a Neighbouring Province, called in to consecrate, the Line of Episcopal Ordination would be right enough, notwithstanding the Abbot, and all his Usurpers. Or suppose, that after the Bishop was ordain'd by the Abbot, One or Two Rightful Bishops should joyn with him in the Consecration of the next, in this Case the Line would be right enough; and all that can be said is, That there was One Usurper in the Line of Jurisdiction, who never was within the Line of Order, and consequently could make no intercision in it.

And perhaps to prevent any Irregularity in the Succession of that Order, the Apostles gave the Example, and the Church enjoyn'd, That a Bishop should be ordain'd by Three at least; and likewise, that he should be Consecrated with the Approbation of his Metropolitan, and Com-Proprials; which practices were certainly a very great security to the Right Succession, it being not very likely, That all the Bishops of a Province should be so extremely careless, to suffer an irregular Ordination, and the Persons concern'd to Consecrate all void of that Character, which they pretended to bestow.

After all, That ever any Abbot that was no Bishop, did ordain Bishops, I do utterly deny. *Adamnanus* in his Life of *Columba*, makes mention of a Bishop in the Abby of *Hy*, and that there was always one residing there, is confirmed by Bishop *Usher*, our

of the
of the
of the
of the

of the
of the
of the
of the

of the
of the
of the
of the

of the
of the
of the
of the

of the
of the
of the
of the

of the
of the
of the
of the

of the
of the
of the
of the

of the
of the
of the
of the

Bp. of St.
Asaph of Ch.
Gov. p. 102.

of the *Willes Annals*: And perhaps the Bishop of *Dankeld* (as the Learned Bishop of *St. Asaph* conjectures) joynd in the Consecration of Bishop *Aidan*, *Finan*, and *Colman* had the like Ordination: But *Tuda*, the next in Succession, was ordain'd a Bishop among the *South Scots in Ireland*. So that should we allow his Instance true, viz. That *Aidan*, *Finan*, and *Colman*, were ordain'd by the Abbot, yet that Succession at *Lindisfarn*, in all likelihood, fail'd in *Colman*, and the Line of Order was right in *Tuda*; and consequently, his Marginal Instance is nothing to the purpose; an Instance that has been frequently urg'd by the *Nonconformists* against Episcopacy, and as often confuted from the most Authentick History of those Times by divers Learned Men: Bishop *Bramhall*, Bishop *Pearson*, the present Bishop of *Worcester*, and *St. Asaph*, and Mr. *Dodwell*, have so fully Answer'd this business of *Hy*, that a Man would wonder at the Confidence of this Gent. that he should still hope to impose the same Mistake upon the World.

Vind. C. E. cap.

9.

Vind. Ignat.

par. 1. c. 10.

Orig. Brit.

Ch. Gov. c. 5.

Barbof. Past.

p. 2. All. 3.

Num. 3. 4. &c.

Maur. de Alz.

de Prac. Episc.

Dig. p. 2. c. 5.

Num. 6, 7, 8, 9.

Aquin. Sup.

q. 38. ar. 1. Res.

ad ter.

Vid. Victor. in

Su n. Num.

116. Sect. de

Sac. Ord.

Non facile cre-

derem Victor.

in sum. Num.

237. quem seq.

Vivald in Can-

del. aureo. p. 1.

tit. de Sacram.

Ordin. Num.

17. in fine as-

serenti se vidit

se quandam

Bullam Papæ

concedentem

facultatem sa-

cerdoti con-

ferendi Diac.

& Sub Diac.

Barbof. Past. p.

2. Al. 3. N. 4.

ap. c. 67.

Mcant. c. 17.

Con. C. P. c. 4

Nor does the Church of *Rome* allow that an Abbot who is no Bishop should Consecrate a Bishop. They are so far from allowing it, that their Canonists generally declare, that the Pope himself cannot empower any Presbyter to Ordain so much as a Deacon. An Abbot who has *Jus Mittere & Baculi*, a Cardinal or an Ordinary Presbyter by Commission from the Pope may confer the lesser Orders, but not the greater, or those which are called Sacred, viz. those of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon; nay even as to the latter, *Thomas Aquinas*, *John Major*, and *Paludanus* affirm, that it is safer to receive the Order of Sub-Deacon from another, than from such a privileged Presbyter. And also *Anguinus* and some few more are of opinion that the Pope might empower a Presbyter to confer the Higher Orders, yet it never was the allowed practice of that Church. And I challenge him to produce so much as one instance of any Abbot that was no Bishop, who ever Consecrated a Bishop. As for Sub-Deacons and such people, who are sometimes Ordain'd by Abbots, the Gentleman knows well enough we have no occasion for 'em, in *England*, and therefore the succession of our Bishops may be just and regular notwithstanding this first Case.

As to the Second, viz. Whether this line of Ordination may be continued in a Schismatical Church? We Answer, 1st. That such was the case of the Primitive Church, so great a regard they had to a right Succession, that they who thought the Ordination of certain Hereticks void such as the *Paulinists* and *Montanists* &c. & *Pebyas* &c. decreed 'em to be Ordain'd by a Catholick Bishop. And it is likewise determin'd by the first Council of *Constantinople* concerning the Ordinations made by *Marinus Cynicus*, that they are all null, they neither allowing him to be a Bishop nor those Ordain'd by him to enjoy any Function among the Clergy. And in the

Roman

Roman Church, particularly those ordain'd by *Constantine* (the Lay-Invader of the Papal Chair), were by a Council under *Stephen* the Third or Fourth, to return to their former Orders, (unless they were in great Esteem with the People, and in that Case they were to be re-ordain'd by the Church; and for fear of laying the Foundations of a future Schism, it was further decreed, That none of them should be promoted to any higher degrees. By these and many other Instances, it is plain what Care the Church has taken to re-ordain, or utterly silence those whose Orders they thought void.

And lest any such persons should creep into strange places, and there invade that Office to which they had no Right: No Man, either of the Clergy or Laity, was to hold Communion with em, under pain of incurring the Ecclesiastical Censures: No Clergy Man was to go abroad without Commendatory Letters; no Bishop to be ordain'd without the Knowledge and Consent of his Metropolitan, and the Neighbouring Bishops. No Heretic to be admitted into Orders; and if ordain'd, to be deposed: No Man to ordain in another's Province: By which, and several other *Canons*, it became extremely difficult for any such Heretics or Schismatics, whose Orders they thought void to meet any considerable intercession in the Line of *Sacrament*.

But I can see no Reason, why the Line of Ordination may not pass through a Schismatical Church: For although by Schism People are out of the Church, and while they continue so, cannot enjoy the benefit either of Ordination or Sacraments, yet to say, That men are absolutely destroy'd, and nullify'd; so that a Schismatical loses the Characters, and can neither be a Christian nor a Minister, nor the Subject of Apostolic Power, till he be baptiz'd and ordain'd, is an Assertion beyond all that can ever be met with. The *Meletians* were Schismatick, and those ordain'd by *Meletius* were received into places, where others were not, though the *Paulianists* and *Catharists* were so baptiz'd and ordain'd by the *Agabians* of the Council of *Nice*: yet those ordain'd by the *Novatians*, when reconcil'd to the Church, were so continue in the same Station which they enjoy'd before (except a Catholick were in possession) by the *Agabians* of the very same Council. From which Instance it is plain, That according to the Sense of those Fathers, though Schismatical Persons and Schisms were out of the Church, yet it did not wholly destroy their Character, so as to make em no longer the Subjects of Apostolic Power, as his Indicator would insinuate.

Nay, the severest Enemies to *Ministerial Ordination*, never went so far as our Author, as appears from what they declare in a publick and evul Case, viz. that of Baptism. *St. Cyprian* himself owns the pre-
G
Greece *ibid* c. 8.

Vid. Cyr. ad
Quintel.
Steph. ap. Cyr.
ad Pomp. ep.
74. Oricent.
ap. Conc.
Carthag.
60. An. 915
ἐπέχει βρε-
τίσματος
ἐν αὐτῶν,
ap. Euf. H. E.
l. 7. c. 7.
Ec. Hist. l. c. 9.
Apost. c. 67.
Con. Nic. Can.
19. 60.
Ap. Cyr. Ed.
Ox. Ep. LXXV.
Novatus
Thurmagado
ap. Con. Carth.

Since in his days to admit reconciled Hereticks, as Penitents only with Imposition of Hands, if at first they were Baptiz'd by the Orthodox Clergy. And so *Heracles of Alexandria* took care that such persons should renounce their Heresies, not at all requiring 'em to be Rebaptiz'd. And in like manner *Miletius* retain'd his Character tho' debar'd the exercise of his Function by the Decree of the *Nicene Council*, as appears by their Synodical Epistle in *Socrates*. So that here the case of Baptism and Ordination run parallel: neither being made void by meer Heresy or Schism, and accordingly we find them put together in several Ancient Canons, and in *Firmilianus's* Epistle to *St. Cyprian*, &c.

'Tis true the case was otherwise with those Baptized or Ordained by Hereticks or Schismaticks; they were to be Reordain'd and Rebaptiz'd, according to the Sentiments of those *African Fathers*. How consistently with their own practice let others judge; for if Hereticks or Schismaticks, did retain their Character while they were out of the Church, as those Fathers seem to allow, I can see no reason why it should be totally out of their Power to confer the like upon other Persons; for if it be said that they lost their Character, by departing from the Church, how they could obtain it again, without a new Ordination is past my understanding: And therefore why *Miletius* himself should retain his Character, and yet those Ordain'd by him be confirmed or settled, *ἡντινοῦται ἡ ἐκείνου* (if by those words is really meant a Second Ordination) I must learn from others.

Socr. ubi. sup.

Vid. Iren.
adv. Hær. l. 1.
c. 18.

Laup. Ep. 15.
18.
Vincent. Lirin.
Com. c. 9. p. 21.
Edit. Cantab.
1687.
Ap. Cyr. ut
Supra. Vid. &
Cyr. in sum in
Epist. Julian

As for the grosser Hereticks, that lived before the time of *St. Cyprian*, and whose several manners of Baptizing were to Monstrous and Wicked, I cannot wonder if the Ancients thought fit to Baptize them over again: Their former Baptism wanting the necessary words, and being Consequently void in the very performance, and therefore when *Tertullian* and other Fathers reject their Baptism, I am of opinion it makes little for *St. Cyprians* Cause. So that notwithstanding the Testimonies produced by a Learned Author, *Agrippinus* might be the first introducer of that Practice, as *Vincentius Lirinensis* testifies: And this I am the rather inclin'd to believe, cause Pope *Stephen* then condemn'd it, as a Novel Custom, and *Firmilianus* and other *Africans*, seem to own, at least could not deny that it was so, as appears by the Answer they made to that Objection.

So that by the most constant usage of the Church in those first Ages, the Baptism of Hereticks was not to be admitted in gross, neither was it Universally to be rejected upon *St. Cyprians* Principles: there being a difference to be made berwixt those Hereticks who did not really Baptize at all, and those that did. And so you find both the first and second Councils of *Arles*, admit such as were Baptiz'd

the'd in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and Rebaptizing only those that did not believe in the Trinity, nor Consequently use the Essential Form, and so Optatus declares, *Quodcumque in Trinitate factum est bene factum est.*

The like distinction I reckon is to be made concerning Ordinations: viz. Those who derived their Orders only from Hereticks, and Consequently never had any Succession from the Church, were justly to be reputed as Unordain'd, but those Ordain'd by Hereticks, who had their Ordination originally from the Church, and did not omit any thing necessary to the conferring of Orders, had no occasion for Reordination. And to let pass the distinction betwixt the Novatians, and Cataphryge, made by the Nicene Fathers, Optatus and St. Austin have both of 'em settled the point in their Controversy with the Donatists, (a) who pretended the Authority of the African Council for Rebaptizing the Catholicks. Thus (b) Optatus in celebrating the Sacrament of Baptism, there are three kinds of things which you can neither increase, nor diminish, nor pretermitt: The 1st. is the Trinity. The 2d. in him that Believes. The 3d. in him that does the Office, but they are not all to be esteem'd of equal moment: For I look upon two of 'em to be necessary, and one as if it were necessary. The Trinity obtains the principal place, the Faith of him that Believes comes next after this, and the Person of him that Ministers is nigh, but cannot be of the same Authority. The two former remain always unalterable, and fixt, for the Trinity is always the same, and the Faith in several Persons is but one, both always retain their proper Efficacy, but the Person of him that Ministers is known that it cannot be equal to the two former sorts, for this reason, because it alone appears to be alterable. &c. And (c) a little before he acquaints us with the practice of the Church at that time: As oft as any one Baptized by you (i.e. the Donatists) desires to come over to us, we receive him according to the Example of our Master with all simplicity, for, far be it from us that we should call him back again to the Font who is already washed, far be it from us that we should repeat that which is to be done but once, or double that which is but one, for so it is written by the Apostle, saying: there is one God, one Christ, one Faith, one Baptism. And St. Austin confirms the same thing: 1st. of all distinguishing, aliud est non habere, aliud pernitiose habere, aliud salubriter habere; and then telling us concerning those that are separated from the Unity of the Church, that there is now no question but that they both have and may confer (both Orders and Baptism). Sed pernitiose habent pernitiosesq; dant, quia extra Vinculum pacis sunt. and the same Father asserts the same Doctrine a little before in two cases; First, If any of the Schismatical Clergy be reconciled to the Church, tho it seems expedient to allow them the exercise of their former Function, yet are they not to be Reordained, &c. and Secondly, If on the contrary the Church judges it not convenient to allow

1. Con. Arel.
c. 8.
2. Con. Arel.
c. 16. 17.
Optat. l. 4.

(a) Vinc.
Lirip. c. 11.
p. 26.
Ed. Cant. 1687
(b) In hoc Sacramento Baptismatis Celebrando tres esse Species Constat, &c. Optat. l. 5. p. 143. Edit. Com. 1599.

(c) Ibid. p. 141, 142.

Aug. l. 2. Cont. Ep. Parmen.

Vid. Tim. them any Ministration, yet their Ordination is not hereby made void, but continues with them still, &c.

For this I might add the practice of the *Greek Church* in former Ages, and the opinion of the *Romanists* at this day, who also they are as little friends to those they call *Schismatics* as any People in the World, yet the most learned of them declare that no Man indeed ought to receive Orders from either *Hereticks* or *Schismatics*, and that both he that gives and he that receives them sin greivously; yet where *Hereticks* or *Schismatics* that Ordain were truly Ordained themselves, and the Ordinations made by them according to the Forms of the Church, such Ordinations are valid, and *Hereticks* or *Schismatics* so Ordained need no new Ordination, but only to be reconciled. And thus we find alledged by Protestants against those Popish Enemies, who sometime have urged the very same Argument against our first Bishops, which this *Vindicator* makes use of now. I wish this were the only instance wherein the Papists and Dissenters are agreed against us.

And now let the Gentleman take his Answer to this difficult question: Whether *Schismatics* can Ordain? It being generally given in the Affirmative, if we may be allowed to believe, as most People do, the deriving of our Orders through a *Schismatical Church* can be no prejudice to the line of Succession: And yet all those Persons who have thus determined concerning the validity of *Schismatical Ordinations* think *Schismatics* out of the Church as much as *T. W.*

Perhaps our Author expected to Triumph in this Confession, and that made him call so earnestly for an Answer to this Question: Supposing that if Ordinations made by *Schismatics* are granted to be valid, our present Non-conformists may find a place among the Clergy, when ever Mr. Baxter and — can obtain a Comprehension without a new Ordination, but this we deny: For although Schism does not invalidate any mans Orders when they are really given, yet this will be no plea for those who never were Ordained, which must needs be the case of many of you who deny the Order of Bishops. For we believe with St. Jerome, that the Power of Ordaining belongs only to the Bishop, and your Ordinations made by Presbyters are all Void and Null; and till you can prove the contrary we take you for no more but a parcel of Lay-intruders into those Holy Functions to which you have no right, (those of you only excepted who have been Episcopally Ordain'd.)

And

And those who have enquir'd more nicely into your *Mission*, are apt to suspect that many of your first *Apostles*, from whom several of you, in all probability, do derive your Orders, never were Ordain'd; and how to distinguish these from others, at this day, we cannot tell. And this is an *Observation* which I suppose the *Vindicator* had never met with; or else he would scarce have been so confident, as to tell us, p. 26. *That they are in the Line still.* And yet it is hard to say, whether he was not aware of some such thing; or else what should make him so earnest, as to lose so many Pages ago nst this *Line of Succession*? which, if it would do him no good, would certainly do him no harm. Methinks it is, at least, a *Master of Reputation* to succeed the *Apostles*; and therefore I can see no Reason why this *Vindicator* should take such pains to oppose it, unless (being conscious to himself, that his Party has no pretence to it) he would, if it lay in his power, make it void or needless, to prevent others insisting upon it, who he knows can make out a better Claim.

It has been the common practice of many others, besides this Gent. to lay aside those *Notions* which their Circumstances would not bear, and to find out New Devices with which they would more easily quadrate. And therefore we cannot wonder, that he looks upon Ordination to be no more but a *Publick Approbation of Ministerial Abilities*: by competent Judges, p. 26. Most of this Man's Party have no other Ordination (and perhaps many of 'em not that). Otherwise, we know, the *Saints* are as tenacious of Priviledges as other Men. And therefore if they could make any tolerable pretence to the *Line of Succession*, they would magnifie it to the full as much as we do.

But why only a *Publick Approbation of Ministerial Abilities*? Does the *Publick Approbation* of a Man's Abilities, invest him in his Office? Will a Testimonial from the *Inns of Court* make a Man a Judge? or from the *Universities* a Minister, without any Commission from the King, or Ordination from the Bishop, or any body else? But this is such a way of making Clergy-men, as never was heard of before. And indeed our Author himself puts in Two other Circumstances in the next page, viz. *That he be chosen by the rest, and set apart by the most competent Judges*, which amounts to a great deal more than only a *Publick Approbation*.

And these Judges he supposes may be *Lay-men* in certain Cases of Necessity: As in case that a Company of *Lay-men* be cast upon an Island, or remain in some Countrey, when their Pastors are all kill'd, or turn'd Hereticks. But in the first place, I must put him in mind, That as no Man is to meddle with the Sacred Offices (except he be call'd of God), no Man to preach, except he be sent; so no

Man

Man is to call or send as from God, but he that is Authorized by him for that purpose. Our blessed Saviour himself, when he gave Commission to his Apostles, recites his own; *All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth; Go therefore, &c. Mat. 28.18, 19. As my Father sent me, so send I you, John 20. 21.* And we hope our Dissenting Brethren, when they go about to Ordain, will not disdain to follow his Example. In all Ages of the Church the calling or sending of persons to the Work of the Ministry, has still been the business of a select Order of Men: Neither is it to be alter'd now, except our Author can shew us a Text of Scripture, whereby Laymen are empower'd to Ordain the Clergy, or some Scripture Instance to justify that Practice. And if this cannot be done, I should be loth to be one of those Laymen, though never so discreet and knowing, that shoud presume to appoint Embassadors for Almighty God, without his Order. Neither can I see any Reason, why a Man may not as well be a Minister of Jesus Christ, without any Mission at all, as by the Mission of those persons who never were sent themselves.

As to the Three Cases, wherein our Author supposes that such Lay-Ordinations became Necessary, we have no Instances before us in Ecclesiastical History of that kind, nor any particular direction in Scripture to do as he thinks we may. And therefore we cannot tell what Method God Almighty would take in such Cases; whether he would revive the *επισκοπαι*, and call persons to the Ministry after an extraordinary manner, that hereby the Authority might again appear to be derived from himself, rather than accept of such unauthorized Ministers, as are only propounded by the People.

Nor is it so easie to guide our selves by Arguments drawn from seeming Necessity, in cases where there is no such Necessity at all. For instance; Suppose that a Company of Christian Women were cast upon an Island, whether would one of them, of the best Qualifications, chosen by the rest, and approv'd, and set apart by the most competent Judges among 'em, to administer in Holy Ordinances to them, be a true Minister of Jesus Christ, and a Lay Person no longer? Here is the same Necessity which our Author supposes; And if the Case holds as to the Men, I can see no Reason why the Women (whose Salvation is as Necessary) should be rejected. But if a well-qualified Sister should happen to win the Hearts of the most competent Judges in Mr. H's Congregation, she must, according to our Author's Argument, be a true Clergywoman at their next Election. Suppose that the Sacred Scriptures should be totally destroy'd, or so corrupted by Hereticks, that it were impossible to learn out of 'em the great Christian Truths, would not *Papists* upon this Supposal, cry up the Use of *Unwritten Tradition*, and the great Necessity of

of an *Infallible Judge*? Would not the *Socinian* argue stiffly for *Natural Religion*? which might be practis'd well enough after all that loss? And why should not the *Quaker* put in for a share, and prefer the *Conduct of Inward Light*; which may easily survive the *Written Word*? And yet what *Orthodox Believer* would abate his Reverence for Scripture, upon the Inferences of such People? No more will it become us to admit *Lay-Ordinations* up n that of our Author, from this *Supposal of Necessity*. As wise Men as he would have concluded another way: Not that *Laymen* are to *Ordain Ministers*, but that where *Ministers* are wanting, People may either minister to themselves, or communicate without Symbols; or forbear till such times as *Ministers* can be had. Why may not Almighty God as well dispense with some One of these things, as with a *Lay-Ordination*? And therefore when so many other Courses may be taken, I would know by what *Logic* this *Vindicator* can prove, That *Lay Ordinations* become Necessary! And if not Necessary, all his Argument is at an end, whereby he would make 'em lawful.

I believe there never was any Case of Absolute Necessity for *Lay-Ordinations*; but if possibly such should happen as the Gentleman mentions, I am apt to believe that *Bishops* and *Ministers*, duly ordain'd, might be had from other Countries; And if not, methinks it would be reasonable and fit, that we should first see what God would do in such Cases, before we presume to do any thing of our selves, for which we have no Scripture-Warrant. In the nighest Cases to his, those of the *Abyssines*, &c. 'tis plain the *Persons concern'd* were of a quite contrary Opinion to that of our Author: The *Abyssines* did not think their want of Ordinances did impower 'em to Ordain Clergymen; but were contented to be without those which are to be dispens'd by *Priests*, till such times as *Fruementius* return'd from *Alexandria*, who was there made a *Bishop* by *Athanasius*, and his *Colleagues* in Council; And yet they serv'd God in the best manner that *Laymen* could do. They had their *Conventicula*, *Meeting-houses*, as *Ruffinus*, *Εκκλησιαι* Oratories or places for Prayer, as *Socrates*, but not to be call'd Churches, as *Valesius* distinguishes: They Catechiz'd, but did not Preach: They pray'd, but had no Sacraments that we read of. And when *Fruementius* came back, like an Apostle of the Country, he was Endowed with the Power of Working Miracles, as the most Authentick Evidence both of his *Doctrin* and *Mission*.

N w if those Christians had been of this Author's Opinion, it might have sav'd *Fruementius* the Fatigue of so long a Journey, for the Christian Merchants at *Auxume* might have Chosen, and Approv'd and set him apart, and without ever troubling *Athanasius*, he had been a true Minister of Jesus Christ, sufficiently Authoriz'd in the

Ruffin. H. E.

I. c. 10.

Soc. H. E. 1.

I. c. 10.

Sunt enim

Conventicula

loca privata in-

quibus collecte

sunt & ab illis

distinguntur

Ecclesie que

sunt publici ju-

ris, &c. Vales.

Amor. in Sec.

I. c. 10.

Work,

Vindic. p. 27. *Work, and a Lay Person no longer.* And if Oswald, King of Northumbria, had but understood the Nature of Ordination, like this learned Gentleman, he needed not have sent to the Abbot of Hy for Bishops; he and his Privy Council, or others of his Christian Subjects might have ordain'd enough. For probably there were not only Christians but Presbyters in Northumbria at that time: Twelve Thousand being baptiz'd according to Nennius and Paulinus; their Archbishop, with the Assistance of Edwin their King, having spent six years in planting and settling Christianity there, and but two years betwixt his going off, and Bishop Aidan's coming thither. And unless the Gent. can shew the contrary, viz. That none of the former Converts were then remaining; or if they were, that none of 'em were better qualified, none more competent Judges than the rest; but all alike. It is plain, by their practice, that they were not of his Opinion.

When ever a new People were Converted to the Faith, great care was always taken to have a Lawful Ministry among 'em, both Bishops and Presbyters duly Ordain'd: For this Reason the Iberians dispatch'd an Embassy to Constantine, desiring that Priests might be sent 'em. And when the Saracens were Converted, Maria, their Queen, desires that Moses, a Saracen, might be the Bishop of that Nation; and when he refus'd to be Ordain'd by Lucius of Alexandria, the Bloody Arian, the Roman Magistrates (we find) carried him to the banished Bishops for Orders, which they needed not have done, if they had been of the Mind of our Author: For if Ordination be nothing more but a publick Approbation of Ministerial Abilities by the most competent Judges, Moses was really Ordain'd before ever he came at those Bishops; his Ministerial Abilities being publickly Approv'd by the Roman Magistrates and the Queen, before he left his own Country. So when Peada, King of the Mid-Angles, was Converted and Baptiz'd in Northumbria, he brought Home with him four Presbyters, viz. Cedda, and Adda, and Betti, and Duma, that he might Propagate the Christian Religion among his own Subjects, and Duma was afterward Consecrated the first Bishop of the Mercians and Mid-Angles, by Finan Bishop of Northumbria; and yet I doubt not but his fellow Presbyters were competent Judges, and might have made him a Bishop as well as Finan, if our Author's way of Ordaining had been then found out: But as the Church never dream'd of any such rare Inventions; so it is plain they thought Episcopal Ordination necessary, that the only way of deriving that Authority from our Saviour, was by Succession, and that no Man might Administer in Sacred things, unless he were thus Admitted. And for this Reason the Council of Celichyld under Wulfred, Archbishop of Canterbury, were so wary, that they would not admit any Stranger of the Scotch Nation to perform any

Nen. H. Brit.
c. 65.
Vid. chron.
sanct. cru. Edin.
ad an. 627.
Angl. Sac. Tom.
1. Hist. de Succ.
cess. Ep. Dunelm.
ib. p. 691.

Ruffin. H. E. l.
1. c. 10.
Soz. H. E. l. 6. c.
38.

Ang. sac. p.
423. *Tho. Cher.*
steri. de Episc.
Cov. & Lich.
ibid. p. 425.

Sacred Office; *quia incertum est nobis unde & an ab aliquo Ordinentur*, because it was uncertain to them by whom, and whether they were ordain'd by any body at all. *Spelm. Conc. Ang. Tom. 1. 329.*

Now as it is plain, from all these Instances, that the *Christians* of several Countries and Ages, were of a quite contrary Opinion to that of our Author, so I might add several more, were I not to deal with Persons, who, rather than lay aside that Scheme of Government which they have lately espous'd, will despise all Antiquity; insomuch that the practice of the very *Apostles* themselves cannot escape their Censure; witness that unseemly Jest wherewith the *Vindicator* endeavours to Ridicule that Sacred Ceremony; *viz.* Imposition of Hands; which being used by *St. Paul*, in the Ordination of *Timothy*, what is here said against it in General Terms, is no less a Libel upon him, than it is upon us.

Vind. p. 27.

I wonder who taught him the Notion of an *uninterrupted Succession* of our English Monarchs, from the Eldest Son of *Noah*. If he can produce it from any Author, I shall then believe that he can speak truth for once. In the mean time, I cannot but admire, that a Man who disputes with so much Pertness, as if every thing that he says were all Oracle, should want either the Sense to understand, or Integrity to report so plain a Notion.

Ibid.

If our Loyalty to English Monarchs is so great a Trouble to these Gentlemen, that they cannot hear it asserted, without torturing their Ears, we cannot help it. I confess it is no more than what I always thought; and since the Gent. so freely owns it, I hope it will be taken notice of: For the Government (which God be thanked is not yet quite a *Commonwealth*) must needs be concern'd in that Grievance; And he that can libel the Grandfather with so much Impudence, and triumph in the Subversion of those Principles, which lately supported the Monarchy, cannot be thought to wish very auspiciously to the present Reign.

Vind. p. 57. &c.

And yet notwithstanding their Natural Aversion, and Spight against Monarchy, so easie and flexible are those Gentlemen to any thing of their own Interest, that when King James the Second afforded 'em a *Tolerat on*, No Complements were too high for him. Subversion of Religion, and cutting of Throats, the dangerous Consequences of a Popish Successor, were absolutely forgotten: The Monarch was no Bugbear, nor the Papists neither; *Irregular* and *Dispensing Power* were harmless, innocent things: His *Leige People*, the *Dissenters*, were vying who should most feelingly express a Thankful Heart; They magnified him as the Generous Leading Pattern to the Princes of other People, and a Father to his own;

Leads Address, June 25. 87.

Independ. and
Bapt. in the
County of Glou.
May, 87.

Dissent. of Mal-
don, Great Coz-
ball, &c. July
9. 87.

Dissenters in
Leathward in
Cumberl. Aug.
87.

Presbyter. of
Colchester, Aug.
2. 87.

You have
hereby echo-
ed to the an-
gelical song,
which brought
him into the
World, who at
his ingress into
it brought
peace, and at
his egress out
of it, brought
peace, and
thereby im-
molated that
Resignation of
a narrow inter-
est, for the Divinity of a more general Preservation; and so tuned the strings of your auspicious
Government, as to make melody over your whole Empire. Presbyt. of Hull, Octob. 87. And a little
after, they call him plainly their Redeemer.

The Assessor and Restorer of God's immediate Dominion over Conscience;
the covering Cherub, under whose refreshing Shadow they promis'd them-
selves Rest. — The First and Happy Instrument, under God, of the
present and future Peace and Prosperity of his Dominions. — One de-
signed for great Services, the blossoming whereof was then made visible in
his Celebrated Wisdom, in happening upon the most melodious Harp to charm
all evil Spirits, that many other Princes had no Skill to use; (though
according to others Concurring hereto with many Noble Princes before
him.) But as others thought fit to express themselves. — Of
all that ever sat upon the English Throne, It shall only be said of
Your Majesties Reign, That from the Western Ocean, even to the
Frozen Thule, then had the Churches Rest, and were multipli-
ed, no one forbidding them. — Your Royal Indulgence, like the
Sound of the Jubilee Trumpet, has so exhilarated the Hearts of your
Dissenting Subjects, that they want Words to express their Gratitude,
and Tongues to Celebrate your Clemency, &c. So dear was that Un-
happy Prince to these People, upon the Account of the In-
dulgence (though at the same time they knew well enough,
that he int'd ded hereby the Ruine of the Established Church),
that they follow'd him with Acclamations and Shouts, beyond
all others; wherever he came. The Flattery of their Addres-
ses had no other Bounds but want of Wit, and that Defect was
oftentimes supply'd with Fustian and Blasphemy. He that reads
em, wou'd think many parts of em to have been taken out of
their Prayers; inasmuch that God Almighty and King James
the Second had in many instances the very same Complements.
Nay, if the Prophet did any where magnifie the Divine Cle-
mency by a most extraordinary flight of Expression, it was pre-
sently got into the Addresses, and apply'd most ingenuously to
King James, to enhance the Dissenters Gratitude for that *Illegal*
Act. So that methinks there is little Room for this Gentleman
to talk of *Lend and Extravagan Caresses between Ambitious Princes and*
Aspiring Churchmen, Vind. p. 28. while those of his own Party are
extant, and may be seen.

Though it should be granted, That Ceremonies have no Moral
Goodness in them (as he says is acknowledged, p. 28.) yet Decency
has, which we think will not easily be preserv'd without them;
and that it is fit they should be chosen and impos'd by the Autho-
rity and Wisdom of Superiours. For if otherwise Religious Of-
fices were to be performed, according to the Opinion and Will
of every Rude and Phantastical Person, we see by the Practice of
Cons

Conventicles, where that Liberty is taken, how awkwardly they would be manag'd; to the great Scandal and Offence of the more Ingenious and Sober People. Nor is it ealie to be imagin'd, That God Almighty should be better pleas'd with the Rudeness of their Worship, than with the Decency of ours. Especially considering, That besides the Practice of the Church in all Ages, we have the Injunction of the Apostle, That all things be done decently, and are to Worship God with our Bodies, as well as with our Souls, which are God's.

As to the Ceremonies of our Church in particular, they are so few, and ealie, that he must certainly be a Man of more than ordinary Peevishness, or less than ordinary Sense, that can take 'em for Incumbrances upon the Worship of God. The Vindicator himself, upon Second Thoughts, will not, under pretence of Spirituality, reject the Natural Decorum of an Action in the Worship of God, which I am very glad to hear, And if he will but do One Thing more, viz. allow the Bishops and Clergy, in Convocation, to be fitter Judges of that Decorum than every mean and half-witted Pastor, there would be very little more requir'd from him.

I am confident, when this is done, that people will be better reconcil'd to our Ceremonies, than to suffer themselves to be Excommunicated, and Damn'd, for not complying with them, as the Vindicator talks, page 281. In the mean time, if any Man be so stiff and peevish, or malicious against the Church, as to deprave her Ceremonies, and so far despise her Jurisdiction and Government, that he will not vouchsafe an Appearance to the most Legal Summons, nor yield to the most Reasonable and Just Monitions in that Case, she does pursue our Saviour's Rule. He that neglects to hear the Church, we think ought to be reckon'd as an Heathen Man, and a Publican, or in the Language of the UNITED MINISTERS — When all due Means for the reducing him prove ineffectual, he having hereby cut himself off from the Church's Communion, the Church may justly esteem and declare it self discharged of any further Inspection over him.

And in this practice the mildest Protestant Churches agree with us. The Reformed Churches of France having us'd a Coercive Power over their inferior Members. Those that should stir up Strife or Contention, to disson or break the Union of their Church, concerning some Point of their Doctrine or Discipline, or about the Manner, Matter, or Style of the Catechism (though of Humane Composition), or the Administration of the Sacraments, Publick Prayer,

Vind. p. 38.

Heads of Agreement. Trin. 3. Sect. 4.

Eccles. Dis. of the Reform. Churches of France, trans. 1642.

ers, &c. shall be censur'd as *Rebellious Persons* — And in case they will not renounce their Errors — then they are to be cut off from the Church. If the Pastor or Elder do it, he shall presently be suspended from his Charge and Employment, and be proceeded against at the next Ecclesiastical Synod. If he teaches False Doctrine, and persists after Admonition; If he is not obedient to the Admonition of the Consistory, or Convicted of Heresie, Schism, or Rebellion, against Ecclesiastical Order, he is to be depos'd. If he thrusts himself into the Ministry, where there is pure preaching already, and will not desist when warn'd of it, he is to be quite cut off, and proceeded against as the Synod shall think fit. And the same Course is to be taken with all his Followers. And at the End of that Book, we are told, That this Order and Discipline had been resolv'd and concluded on by no less than Twenty Seven National Synods, from 1559 to 1637, &c.

Now if these Reformed Churches of France were not to be Censur'd as Uncharitable, for the Establishment and Exercise of this Discipline, I know no Reason why ours should lie under that imputation.

In the next Paragraph he finds fault with *T. W.*'s. Notion of of the Communion of Saints but gives none of his own, whether for fear lest he should mistake, or lest his own Party should be condemn'd by it, I shall not now enquire. It is certainly a nice Point for Separatists to manage, it being hard for those that neither Pray with, nor receive the Sacraments, nor live under the Government of any Church, to Demonstrate plainly how they hold Communion with all, as this *Vindicator* confidently pretends. However though he could establish nothing himself; yet that he may do something towards finding fault with *T. W.* he proceeds to examine his aggregate description of the Communion of Saints, which he tells you consists of these things.

First, A firm belief of all the Articles of Faith contain'd in the Apostolical, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. Now this mightily offends him: 1st. Because it was not said in Scripture; as if he that believes those Creeds did not believe Scripture. Those Creeds, tho of human composition, yet are according to Scripture, and contain the Faith into which Christians are Baptized. They are the *Sym'ola* wherein the Orthodox of all Countreys agree, and whereby they have distinguished themselves in several Ages, from those Hereticks which did not assent to them. The two former have been generally received, and admitted, into the *Liturgies*

Symbolum
Apost. exigi
cepit ubi va-
riz Hæresis in
Ecclesiam irru-
perant Voss. de
tribus Symb.
Dis. 1. c. 14.

of

of the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches, and therefore it is strange how the *Vindicator* can suppose that the *Greek* and other *Eastern* Churches are shut out by this condition of *Communion*.

'Tis true in the Article of the Procession they objected against the *Latins*, the addition of *Filiog*, in the *Nicene* or *Constantinopolitan* Creed, (and perhaps not untruly, considering that in the old *Ordo Romanus* published by *Hittorpius*, wherein that Creed is ordered to be used in both Languages these words, tho in the *Latine*, yet are omitted in the *Greek*). But nevertheless they us'd the Creed, and from them it came Originally into the *Latine* Church. And as to that which we receive under the Name of *Athanasius*, those among the *Greeks* who thought it to be his, had always a very great veneration for it. But in some *Greek* Copies the words *καὶ υἱὸς* are left out. So that upon the whole matter the *Eastern* Churches have no quarrel against either of those * Creeds. All their contention with the *Western* in this case is about the true Reading of them †. And therefore unless he had been more particular about that, this first Branch of *T. W.*'s description may stand, and yet neither the *Greek* or any *Eastern* Church be excluded.

τὸ ἐν τῷ β' ἑκ
ἐκπορεύομε-
νοι, τὸ οὖν
πατὴρ καὶ
υἱὸς συμπρο-
συνόμενοι,
qui ex patre
filioq; procedit,
qui cum
patre & filio
simul adoratur
Hittorp. Ordo
Rom. de Div.
Offic. v. 39.
Ed. Col. 1568.

Vide & Voss. de tribus 9. Symbol. Diss. 3 c. 20. &c.

* Combesis. ad Man. Caléc. not 55.

† Symbolum fidei, quod ipsi profitentur idem est atque illud quod Latini in Missa recitant: Differunt in eo à Latinis quod ipsi de spir. Sancto. dicunt, qui ex Patre procedit, Latini qui ex Patre filioque procedit; id cum Græci non negent idem cum Latinis dicere existimandi sunt. Leo All. de Conf. l. 3. c. 10. Sect. 1.

Secondly, To partake of the same Table, 'tis true *T. W.* did not mean the same individual Table, as the Gentleman rightly supposes, and yet he meant something more than barely the same *Eucharist* in *Specie*; Hereticks and Schismatics, may deliver the same *Eucharist* in *Specie*; and yet he that Communicates with either is not thereby in the *Communion* of the Saints.

Thirdly, To joyn all in the same Holy Prayers, and Supplications, and giving of Thanks: *T. W.* does not hereby Excommunicate all the rest of the World. For although the Forms of Holy Prayer, &c. are different in several Countreys, yet people joyning with the Church where they live in its Holy Devotions, do answer this Branch of the Description and those *Christians* who refuse and separate from them are certainly Schismatics.

Fourthly,

Partly, To be Subject and Obedient to our Spiritual Rulers, and Governors, who have derived their Authority from the Apostles by a due Succession in all things pertaining to *godly Life, Decency and Order.* He cannot except against this: They are desirous to give due Honour and Obedience to their Spiritual Governors who derive their Authority from Christ, but still he endeavours to justify their Separation upon two accounts.

First, Because he thinks the Bishop ought not to Govern so many Congregations, nor by such Rules, and Officers, as they do. Neither,

Secondly, By the nomination of the Civil Magistrate without the consent of the People, or the Ministers within the Diocess, and while he does so, he is a Creature not to be found either in Scripture or in the Primitive Times, and therefore can be no Spiritual Governor of theirs by Divine Right.

As to the Government of so many Congregations, we think it not Essential to the Office of a Bishop: It being not the greatness of the City he lives in, or the extent of his Diocess, or the Number of Congregations, but the Ordination that makes him a Bishop. We acknowledge with St. Jerome that the poor Bishop of Engubium had the same Order, and Authority, with him of Rome, and that he of Tanis was equal in that respect to him of Alexandria, and that Milles the Martyr in Sozomen who had never a Christian within his Diocess, was as truly a Bishop as he who had all Scythia under his care.

On the other hand to persuade us that the great Extent of a Bishops Diocess does make void his Office, will be a task, I am afraid too difficult for our Author to manage. We have no such Doctrine in Scripture. And this conceit as it is beyond the malice, so it is below the Sense of all Hereticks and Schismaticks in former Times. And if it were true, the Apostles themselves must have been the greatest Usurpers. They having a larger extent of Jurisdiction even according to this Author, than any of their Successors. But this Argument has been so Copiously, and so lately managed by Doctor Maurice in his Learned Defence of Diocessan Episcopacy, that I shall only need to refer the Reader thither.

Secondly,

Secondly, As for the Officers used by our *English* Prelacy, we think them such as are extremely useful, in order to the more regular and easy management of the Episcopal Charge. The *Chancellor* is a Person well learned in the Canon and Civil Laws, and consequently able to judge or assist the Bishop in his Judicial Proceedings. Nor is it any great exception against him, in my Opinion, that he is a *Layman*, while there is no Necessity for him Personally to perform any of those things which belong only to the Clergy: The *Dean Rural* is a Temporary Officer under the Archbishop or Bishop, *ad aliquid ministerium exercendum Constitutus*. — *Cujus Officium est in causis ecclesiasticis citationes et transmissas exequi* — *cujus sigillum in talibus erit authenticum*.

*Lyndem. de
Constit. q. incor-
tin. Dec. Rural.
vid. plura de ju-
dicis, c. 1.
Dec. Rural.*

The Rules they go by are the Canon and Civil Laws, where the Laws and Canons of our own Kingdom have not expressly directed. The Authority they have is from the Bishop, and the Law. So that he who disobeys them in the just and legal Exercise of their Authority, disobeys both. *How Sacred and Certain that Authority is*, I with these Gentlemen may consider.

And if it were purely a matter of Choice, yet methinks Church-Affairs are more likely to be well manag'd under our *English* Prelacy, by such Officers and Rulers, than after the Independent Fashion, by the Sudden and Arbitrary Determination of every Mean and Ordinary Pastor, perhaps in a Consistory of Clowns, who must Pole for that Truth and Equity, which they do not understand: And if either the Pastor, or any body else happens to be wiser than the rest, so as to judge right, have Power to over-rule his Sense and Arguments, either by Votes or Tumult.

Neither, Thirdly, Do we think the Consent of the People, or of the Ministers of the Diocese, Essential to the Office of a Bishop: Our Saviour Constituted his Apostles without it; We have no Command in Scripture for any such Consent: The Practice of the Primitive Times was various; and therefore we think it a Matter left wholly to the Discretion of the Church. *Matthias* and *Justus* seem to be appointed by the People, as well as the Apostles, *Acts* 1. 15. &c. But the Apostleship was not determined by that Election, but by the Lot which fell upon *Matthias*: For *Justus*, who was equally Sharer with him in that Act of the People, was thereby no more an Apostle than he was before. And perhaps the same way of Chusing by Lots, might be used by St. *John*, as Mr. *Dodwell* conjectures; but was never

Diff. Cyprian.

PRO-

probably, in Use after the Apostles Days; though if it had been Necessary, we cannot believe it would have been omitted in the following Ages. The Seven Deacons (we read) were Elected by the People, but receiv'd their Authorities and Office from the Apostles, by imposition of Hands.

And these are, I believe, all the Instances of Popular Elections that can be found in Scripture; but from none of 'em is it evident, that the Election of the People did contribute any thing that was Essential to Holy Orders.

The Reason why it was admitted, was, that they might confer the Power and Character upon the Best and most Unexceptionable Persons; such as were of Honest Report; which could not so easily be known, without consulting the Multitude: And this is all the Use that St Cyprian makes of the aforementioned Instances, who tells us, "That it was so order'd
" in the Case of Eleazar, the Son of Aaron, and ought to
" be so, that the Crimes of ill Men may be Detected, and
" the Deserts of Good Men Extoll'd ——— And that the
" Apostles proceeded so diligently and warily in the Choice
" of Matthias, and the Seven Deacons, lest any Unworthy
" Person should creep into the Service of the Altar, or obtain
" the Degree of Priesthood. And he adds further, "That
" in his Time it was the Custom for the Neighbouring Bishops
" of the same Province, to Meet and Chuse a Bishop in the presence
" of the People, who fully understood each Man's Life.
" And after this manner they advanced Sabinus into the Place of
" Basilide".

All this seems to be plainly allow'd by the Council of Laodicea, which will have none to be made Bishops, but such as are of Known and Approved Conversation; and provides that they should be constituted, *Κείσε τὰν μετροπολιτῶν καὶ περιεπολιτῶν*, by the Discretion of the Metropolitans, and Neighbouring Bishops. In which Points it agrees exactly with St. Cyprian's Model; and yet the Canon immediatly following, will not allow the People to chuse those that are to be advanced to the Priesthood; and therefore surely their Consent was not then thought Essentially Necessary to the making of a Bishop. Nay, so far was the Church from the Opinion of this Author, that upon the Death of Auxentius, the Arian Bishop of Milan, the Synod petition'd the Emperour, That he would chuse one to succeed him in that See; which certainly they would not have done,

Cyp. Ep. LXVIII.
Ed. Oxon.

Con. Laod. Can.
12.

Can. 13.

Theod. H. E. l. 4.
c. 7.

done, if they had thought that his Nomination would have made him such a Monster, as our Author speaks of, viz. *A Creature not to be found in Scripture, or the Primitive Times.*

I might add several other Instances of Bishops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs, chosen to their respective Charges, by the Discretion of the Emperour and other Princes; but I suppose it is not necessary.

As to the Nomination of our *English* Prelacy; suppose it had been of right Originally in the Clergy and People, yet they by their Representatives in Parliament, have confirm'd it to the Prince; So that it is his by Law: And for my part, I know no Reason why it should not so continue. Episcopacy is the same, chuse who Names; it being not the Nomination, but the Ordination that makes the Bishop. And if that be the same now which it was in the Primitive Times, our Episcopacy must needs be the same with theirs.

Page 33, and 34. The Gentleman is willing to be try'd by the Pattern of those Churches which are truly Primitive; but I find he dares not venture far among 'em, for fear of losing his Cause. He complains, "That a Century, or Two, made a considerable Change in the Features of their Government and Worship: but in which Century that Change was wrought, he durst not inform us. However, if he pleases to venture his Cause upon it, let him take any of the first Fifteen, to prove Congregational Episcopacy; and (provided he will allow the Writers of that, or the next Age, to be credited before those that liv'd later) I shall freely joyn issue with him.

We have a Specimen of his Abilities already, page 34 and 35. where he tells us, "That *Ignatius* charges the Bishop to take a personal cognizance of every Member of his Church, not excepting the very Servants.

And Secondly, "That it was the Custom then in every Congregation to receive the Sacrament every Lord's Day; and that they never receiv'd it, *nisi ex antistitis manu*, but from the Hand of the Bishop. What could such Bishops be more than Pastors of single Congregations? To which I Answer:

τοῖς κατ' ἀν-
δρα ἡ β-
ἡθελαν θεῶ
λῆλει, Ignat.
Ep. ad Polyc.

First, That *Ignatius* does indeed require of the Bishop, to discourse people singly, as God should enable him : But how does this prove, That he was to take a Personal Cognizance of every particular Member of his Church ? Had he no body to assist him in the Remoter parts of his Church ? Why could no Man else acquaint him with the Fraities and Misdemeanours of particular persons, but all must depend wholly upon his own Cognizance and Observation ? Or because he was not to content himself barely with Publick Preaching, but was to discourse em particularly, as he found occasion : Does it therefore follow, that he must needs be acquainted with every Member of his Church ? How if they were too numerous, or liv'd too remote to be all Personally discours'd with ? All that *Ignatius* requires is, so far as God shall enable him ; Which kind of Expression, methinks, implies some difficulty — Let Assemblies be held often ; Enquire after all by their Names ; do not desist, or behave thy self insolently towards the Men-Servants, or Maid-Servants.

ἡ συνάγωγα
συναγωγὰι
γινέσθωσαν,
ἐξ ὀνόματι
πάντες ἑ-
τεῖ δόξας
καὶ δόξας
μὴ ὑπερ-
φάνει, Ibi.

This, I suppose, is the Passage to which our Author principally refers. Though if he had been able to have quoted it, we might have been abundantly more certain. However, from this it is not to be concluded, that he must take a personal Cognizance of every Member of his Church, or that he was the Pastor only of One single Congregation ; For how does he prove, That those συναγωγὰι were to be only at One Place ? Why might not the several Assemblies in his Diocess be as well comprehended under that Title ? Again, how does our Author prove, that συναγωγὰι signifies no more but the Ordinary Congregations ? Why not the more Extraordinary Assemblies, when the Bishop Visited ? Perhaps the Bishop had a Scroll, wherein the Names of Christians were enroll'd ; and in calling them over at his Visitations might enquire into the Faith and Manners of particular Persons, and call for the Men themselves, and as he found Occasion, discourse em, κατ' ὁσθα, by way of Doctr ine, Admonition, or Reproof : Or, peradventure he might call over the Names of the Congregation where he himself was present, that he might hereby discover who were heretically inclin'd : For even then such Persons began to withdraw from the Communion of the Church, and to hold Conventicles, though very privately. And if we take it in the latter Sence, it will contribute little to his Cause, unless he could first prove, That the Bishop's Congregation

gregation would not be a Pattern to the rest, and that 'Ευχαριστίας there were no Subordinate Presbyter to do the same thing, καὶ προσευ-
by the Bishops Order, in other Congregations within his χῆς ἀπὸ χο-
Dioecis. τὰς διὰ τοῦ

μὴ ἀποδοχεῖν, &c. *Id. ad Smyr. τὰς δὲ μετὰ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ὡς ἀρχὴν κοινὴν*
—ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπισκοπῶν τὴν Περσίδα τῷ διαβόλῳ παύεται. *Ibid.*

Vid. Dodw. in Irene. Dis. 1. Sect. XVII.

And that there were more Congregations than one under the Bishop of Smyrna, is evident from that Passage of Ignatius, in his Epistle to them; Let no man perform any of those things which belong to Publick Assemblies, without the Bishop, That Eucharist is to be thought valid, which is either under him, or at least, which he allowed. What had he to do to allow the Eucharist in Congregations Independent upon him, and to talk of giving allowance to himself in his own is to great a Blunder for Ignatius to be charged with. So that all the distinction here made is betwixt a Congregation under the Bishop, viz. that where he was Personally present, and another Congregation Assembled by his permission, and allowance; and must consequently imply that in the Church of Smyrna there were several Congregations under one Bishop, what relates to Servants is nothing to this purpose in Ignatius, whatever it was in our Authors Head.

Nor is the Second Alligation more regular or just than the former. (*Antistitis manu*) in Tertullian (for thence it came Originally by way of Mr. Baxter to our Author) referring not to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, but to the Form of Renouncing the Devil, &c. which was preparatory to Baptism, and the persons to be Baptized did it *sub Antistitis manu*, for (ex) as this Man quotes it would have made it Non-sense. Tertullian does indeed speak of the Lords Supper not to be Received *nisi de Presidentium manu*, But this will do our Author no Service: The word

ἡμεῖς χάρις τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τὴν
προσέτα τῶν ἀνεκέντων εἰς τὴν ἐκ-
κλησίαν. Ἐκείνη βιβλὶον εὐχαριστίας ἡ-
γεῖσθαι ἢ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπισκοπικόν. &c. ἢ ὅ-
τιν ἀνὴρ ἐπέβη. *Ig. ad Smyrn.*

Aquam adiri ibidem, sed & ali-
quanto prius in Ecclesia sub Antistitis
manu conestlamur nos Renunciare Dial-
bolo &c. — Eucharistiae Sacra-
mentum & in Tempore victus, & Om-
nibus & mandatum a Domino, etiam
antelucanis Ceribus, nec de Aliorum
manu, quam presidentium fumimus.
Tert. De Cor. Milit. c. 3.

Præfidentium including the Bench of Presbyters, as well as the Bishop in *Cathedra*.

Vid. Pearſ. Vind.

Ignat. p. 2. c.

13. Affert. 7.

Dod. in Iren.

Diſt. 1. Sect. VII.

d

*Qua propter
eis qui in Ecclef.
ſunt Preſ. ob-
audire oportet
hiis qui Succeſ-
ſionem habent
ab Apoſtoliſ ſi-
cut oſtendimus,
qui cum Epifc.
Succeſſione cõ-
riſma veritatis
Certum ſecun-
dum placitum
Patris accepe-
runt. Iren. l. 4.
c. 4. 3.
Iren. l. 4. c. 43*

Not will the Paſſage out of *Irenæus*, which he ſo haſtily miſapplies (if fully cited and underſtood,) afford any advantage to his cauſe. Presbyters in that Father, oftentimes denoting the Age, rather than the Office of thoſe Perſons meant by it, as divers Learned Men have already obſerved. And in that Sence not only Presbyters, but likewiſe Biſhops, Deacons and Laymen might be comprehended under that Title: And accordingly *Irenæus* diſtinguiſhes by divers Characters telling them what ſort of Elders they were to hearken to, viz.

First, *Eis qui in Eccleſia ſunt*, thoſe who are within the Pale of the Church.

Secondly, *Hiis qui Succeſſionem habent ab Apoſtoliſ*, &c. thoſe who had the Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, and who together with the Succeſſion, in their Epifcopal Charge, did receive the ſure Gift of Truth, according to the Will of the Father.

Whence it is plain that *Irenæus* in this place, means Biſhops only when he talks of the Apoſtles Succeſſors. And therefore our Authors Inference in behalf of Presbyters having their Succeſſion from the Apoſtles as well as Biſhops, is out of Doors. *Irenæus* reckons up the Biſhops of Rome in order as they Succeeded to *Eleutherius* then Biſhop, who was the Twelfth from the Apoſtles, concluding *Hac Ordinatione & Succeſſione*, &c. by this Ordination, and Succeſſion, that Tradition which is in the Church from the Apoſtles and the Preaching of the Truth is handed down to us: From which it is plain that Succeſſion in their days, was more than bare Conformity to the Apoſtles Model in Government and Worſhip: For they Succeeded the Apoſtles.

First, *In Power and Authority*, So *Irenæus* ——— *quibus etiam ipſas Eccleſias Committebant* ——— *quos & Succeſſores relinquebant ſuum ipſorum, Locum Magiſterii tradentes.*

Secondly, *In Place*, So *Linus* was conſtituted the Succeſſor of St. Peter, and St. Paul, at Rome; and *Irenæus* tells us further that they made him Biſhop. And therefore if his Succeſſors afterwards mentioned kept up to the Apoſtles Model, they muſt likewiſe derive their Office as he did, from Perſons inveſted with the ſame Character, and Conſequently as *Linus* was Ordained by the Apoſtles, who had that Epifcopal Authority in themſelves, which

which they conferred upon him, So the rest down to Eleutherius must be Ordained by Bishops. And if so let our Author consider with himself whether his Notion, or ours, is nearer in all Points to the *sense of those Times*.

When I consider how nice and strict this Gentleman was in the Notion of Succession, P. 19. 20 that he could not allow Two Bishops to Succeed One Apostle, nor One to Succeed Two, I cannot but wonder that in the Writing of 16 Pages, his Head should grow so loose as to make it no more than Conformity to the Apostles Model in Government and Worship. Sure, if this be the truest Sense as the Gentleman affirms, One Bishop may Succeed Two Apostles, or One Apostle be Succeeded by Twenty Bishops without any such absurdity or Blunder as our Author cries out against in the fore-quoted Pages.

We all grant that for Persons wilfully to withdraw themselves from such particular Churches as are framed according to Scripture Rules, and impose no new or needless Terms, is to Act Schismatically, because such wilfull Separation when no cause is given, cannot be without breach of Charity with our fellow Christians, Page 37. Yes it may through the prejudices of Education, or for want of understanding: People may take that to be New which is very Old, and that which is very Decent and Fit to be Imposed, to be altogether Needless; and withdraw themselves from particular Churches fram'd according to Scripture Rules, when purely out of mistake they think them otherwise. They may be led by Interest, or won over by persuasion, to a new Communion, and yet have no hard thoughts of that Church, or its Members, which they left. I cannot believe that every Dissenter at his first going off from the Church of England, does immediately hate us; I find several of 'em very Kind and Affable Persons; And yet if our Author has granted Right, all their Charity (though a very good and commendable thing) cannot excuse 'em from the Guilt of acting schismatically.

And because our Author has granted this; I shall grant likewise, That Schism is frequently the Effect of Uncharitableness, which perhaps was all that honest Mr. H. meant, when he call'd it *formalis ratio*. People are sometimes iroward and peevish, and apt to take Pet at little things; and when they are once angry, and out of charity, will forsake the best friends in the world (tho perhaps for worse Company); And the new Acquaintance, if he be not very dull, will be ready enough, for his own advantage, to find out Suggestions, true or false, to confirm and improve the Quarrel.

Again,

Again, Uncharitableness is otherwise the Effect of Schism; when People have no way to justify their Separation from an Orthodox Church, and to support and propagate the Cause which they have engaged in, but by vilifying and expelling its Members, and abusing every thing that belongs to its Communion: And when by the long continuance of these Practices, they have so far wrought upon their own belief, as to think those Objections right, which at first were only taken up to serve a Passion, or Design; and that both Persons and Things are really as bad as they have been used to represent 'em: When they look upon others as the Enemies of God, and Opposers of his pure Worship, as Reprobates, and Damn'd themselves, and Hinderers of the Salvation of others. It is no wonder if they make no Scruple of the most Violent and Uncharitable Practices: Especially when Ambition, Covetousness, and Vain-Glory go along with these Conceits.

And yet in the very height of Violence and Cruelty, it will be no mean Task to persuade 'em, That they are uncharitable, nor consequently Schismatics in Mr. *H's* Notion; For Charity is seated in the heart, which no Man can look into; and therefore the breach of it not otherwise Visible than by outward Practices. And as to those, be they never so Villainous, yet it is in vain to object 'em, while they are committed under the Patronage of a Righteous Cause, and also with a great Appearance of Devotion and Sobriety. If you are robb'd and plunder'd by One of these People, you are not to call him a Thief, or to say, he was Uncharitable, for thus undoing his poor Neighbour; for it was only the spoiling of an *Egyptian*, or, in another Phrase, the weakening of the wicked. If they kill you, it cannot be Murder, so long as the Example of *Phineas* stands upon Record.

Or if he destroys his Prince, yet if he can but once pass *Tyburne*, he's no Traytor; there is Scripture enough, as he thinks, to discharge him from that Guilt. And as for the more puny Instances of Uncharitableness, such as Lying and Slandering, and raising Tumults, and the most Grave and Solemn Perjuries, to promote the Cause, either the Love of Good Men, or Zeal for Reformation, will easily excuse 'em among Friends: And to prevent Scandal among other People, if they be done one Day, they may be denied the next.

If any Tradefman appears more than ordinary in Defence of the Church, no Schismatick is to have any Dealing with him; and if you say, he is Uncharitable, he tells you, No, surely! He has the Management of his own Purse, and may lay out his Money where he pleases. If any injur'd Catholick goes about to Right himself in a Court of Judicature, get a Jury of *Donatists*, and he is so far from obtaining any Relief, or Benefit of Law, that he is sure to be Condemn'd. And if you say, the Jury was Unjust, they will bring their Action. — Take Warning by your Neighbour; for they went according to their Consciences, and you are not to question their Reputation. If any Clergyman appears against 'em, in Defence of the Church, it shall be their whole business to make him Odious, to expose his Faults, in case he be any way noxious; which Charity would rather cover, and by Detraction and Calumny, to lessen and deprave the Character of the most Excellent Persons. If he be of a Grave and Reserv'd Conversation, they shall accuse him of Pride; if more chearful and free, he shall be Reputed Dissolute; if Thrifty, Covetous; if Liberal and Charitable, it shall be said, that he does it out of Vain-Glory, or the hopes of Merit: And if he be more than ordinarily strict in the Duties of Fasting and Prayer, he shall be reckon'd Superstitious, and the best Title he can obtain, will be that of a very great Formalist. In fine, be they Clergy, or Lay-people, the violent Schismatick, he that either manages the Faction, or hates the Church, will never speak well of 'em, where he can find the least Occasion, or pretence to speak ill.

And, as in all these Instances, the Charge of Uncharitableness is confidently eyaded, so I would know of these Gentlemen, how Schism, in their *Notion*, may be discover'd, so as that a Dissenter may be Convicted, if he be really Guilty: For if it be one of the *blackest Crimes, the Arch-Rebel of all in Christs Kingdom*, it is very fit that it should be reprov'd and discountenanc'd. But I cannot see how this can be done, till we first know how to fix it upon particular Persons, We desire therefore a plain Answer:

First of all, by what Rules that is to be done?

And Secondly, Whether those who are concern'd in the fore-mention'd, and such like Practices, are not really Schismaticks? For if they are, we hope that Mr. H. and the rest of his Way, who boast what Power they have within themselves to Admonish, Suspend, and Reject Scandalous Persons, will to order the matter ~~that there may be no such People in any~~

of

of their Congregations. For otherwise, if we see a Book written to prove Uncharitableness to be Schism, and the Crime of Schism therein aggravated to the highest degree, and yet the Author's own Congregation crowded with Uncharitable People, what can we think of the Discourse; but that it was all meer Banter; And that all the Power of Admonishing, &c. which they so eagerly challenge, is to be employ'd only for the Advantage of the Conventicle, but never against any of those Practices, though never so violent or scandalous, that serve to promote its Interest.

What he says to p. 40. has been already Answer'd, as far as it is material; And there ends his Vindication of Mr. *FP's* Notion. So that having examin'd him hitherto with as much Patience as he did *T. W.* I shall pursue him no further, hoping that I need not trouble my self about the Remarks on either side.

F I N I S.

ook
me
vet
ble
it
th-
d
st
is,

as
o-
i-
at